Clerk's' Files Copy IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION ATARI, INC., et al., Plaintiffs, No. 81 C 6434 NORTH AMERICAN PHILIPS CONSUMER ) THEN 1 0 1982 BEFORE: The Honorable GEORGE N. LEIGHTON, Tuesday, March 16, 1982 TI DESIRE WILL CALL

## PRESENT:

vs.

de Wall so first

ELECTRONIC CORP., et al.,

MR. DANIEL VITTUM

MR. DAVID SPRINGER

MR. MARTIN L. LAGOD

for the plaintiff Atari, Inc.;

Defendants.

COURTS CONTOUR BO

Judge.

9:00 a.m.

MR. ERIC COHEN

MR. DONALD WELSH

for the plaintiff Midway Mfg. Co.;

Sala named Spall-poor last name, late foreign

MR. THEODORE W. ANDERSON

MR. JAMES T. WILLIAMS

MR. GREGORY B. BEGGS

for the defendants.

23

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

12

11

13

14

16

17

19

20

22

23

24

25

THE CLERK: 81 C 6434, Atari v. North American.

THE COURT: You may proceed to call your first witness. Go right to a hearing of the evidence.

MR. ANDERSON: Good morning, your Honor.

Thank you.

We will go first?

THE COURT: Pardon me.

MR. ANDERSON: I presume we will go first.

THE COURT: Oh, yes.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. Mr. Beggs will call the first witness.

Thank you.

THE CLERK: This way, Mr. Witness.

MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, we will call Mr. Frederico,

please. The do you report

THE CLERK: Come forward and be sworn,

Mr. Witness.hat is his postalony

VINCENT FREDERICO,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Be seated, please, and state your full name. Spell your last name, lean forward and speak directly into that microphone and keep your

voice up.

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. BEGGS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Will you please state your name and address for the record, please.

A Vincent Frederico, 5001 North Mozart, Chicago, Illinois.

- Q Did you receive a subpoena to testify here today?
- A Yes.
- Q What is your employment?
- A I work for Minnesota Fats.
- Q What is your position there?
- A. Merchandise manager.
- Q How long has that been?
- A Eighteen months.
- Q Who do you report to?
- A Michael Friedman.
- Q What is his position?
- A He is the owner of the company.
- Q Is there any connection between Minnesota Fats and Showtime Video that you are aware of?
  - A Yes, they are owned by the same company.
- Q What is your connection, if anything, with the advertising of Minnesota Fats and Showtime Video?
  - A Well, I give my input to the ads from a

```
merchandise standpoint to Mike Friedman.
1
        Q For both of those companies?
2
        A Yes. County Sure, Just mark the exhibits.
3
        Qual Minnesota Fats and Showtime?
        As yoYes. we the destroation stickers,
5
6
7
        Tour Roung .
8
9
10
11
12
            MM. REDGS: Defendants' Exhibit 27.
13
            THE COUNTY AND FIght.
14
15
        Q Mr. Frederico, I show you an advartisement,
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

MR. BEGGS: I will ask the -- your Honor, may we get together with the reporter later?

THE COURT: Sure. Just mark the exhibits. Just, physically, mark them unless you want the -do you have the designation stickers?

MR. BEGSS: We have some stickers on them, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Just mark them. What number is this one?

MR. BEGGS: This will be 27, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BEGGS: Defendants' Exhibit 27.

THE COURT: All right.

### BY MR. BEGGS:

Mr. Frederico, I show you an advertisement, document that purports to be an advertisement, and I have marked it Defendants' Exhibit 27.

Is that a Minnesota Fats ad?

A Yes.

MR. BEGGS: And your Honor, I earlier intended to mark the copy for reference purposes, and I have a copy here for counsel of the paper out of the newspaper.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. BEGGS:

Q Is that a Minnesota Fats ad that appeared in the Chicago Tribune?

Yes. Jorth Assertan Philips Consumer Slectronics

Q What was the date of the Tribune appearance?

A . Bo The The Part of the State of the Stat

A March 4, 1982.

Q . What were the expensioners of Minnesota Fate

plantar this se in the navepaper.

Style of advertising.

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

20

22

24

23

25

Was that ad placed in the newspaper by Minnesota Fats?

A Yes. The manufacture their products.

Q Did North American Philips Consumer Electronics Corporation have anything to do with the placing of this ad in the newspaper?

A . No. Merian of the ad which refers to the

Q Or Park Television?

A No. The play has -Min mee with K. C. Munchille,

Q Do you have any knowledge of the circumstances of this ad getting in the newspaper?

Yes.

Q . What were the circumstances of Minnesota Fats placing this ad in the newspaper?

A Well, I was placed in charge of the advertising in Mike Friedman's absence and because he was out of the country and I instructed Dawn Wagner, our advertising manager, to go back in the files and look at ads that we had previously run and to lift some ideas out of those ads and place them into this ad, since it was her first week on the job and she was unfamiliar with our type or style of advertising.

Q Did Minnesota Fats expect to be paid in any respect for this advertisement by Atari? Yes. Yes.

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

- What were those circumstances?
- A Well, there is advertising money that is accrued for dealers to spend to advertise their products.
- Q What was the connection between that advertising money and this ad?
  - A We used that money to pay for this ad.
- Q Is the portion of the ad which refers to the Magnavox Odyssey material and particularly the phrase "Odyssey lets you play Pac-Man now with K. C. Munchkin," is that something Minnesota Fats put in the ad?

A or Yes. Interesting the ton the this was not

Q To your knowledge, what references is Minnesota Fats permitted to make in advertisements for K. C. Munchkin to the term "Pac-Man"?, and want we propose to show is

A In a clarification sense to let the consumer know what type of game it is, we clarify games as space games, educational-type games, maze games. Therefore, if a reference was ever made to any particular type of game it would be for classification purposes.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, I'll object to this entire line of questioning. It is outside the scope of the limited purpose of this remand, and this witness' testimony as to his legal opinion about how Pac-Man was misused in that ad is certainly not a matter that is before the Court in terms of that stay.

MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, may I speak to that?
THE COURT: Surely.

MR. BEGGS: The Court of Appeals in its order of March 11, 1982, as I read it, on page 2 in the second paragraph refers to controlling circumstances not appearing in the record previously before the Court of Appeals, and in the next sentence they refer to the defendants' continued advertising.

Now, what we had tried to make clear at the earlier proceedings in this Court on the motion for preliminary injunction was that this was not defendants' advertising. Mr. Giese spoke about it, but we didn't have the testimony of the people who were responsible, and what we propose to show is that -- oh, there is one other item I wanted to mention. This advertisement which the witness is testifying about was attached by the plaintiffs to their motion to vacate your stay of the injunction.

What we want to show as clearly as we know how to show is this is not the defendants' advertising and the Court of Appeals seems to be confused on that.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, the defendants at the trial in November made these same facts about Minnesota Fats, the fact that Minnesota Fats was not a part of the cooperative advertising program of record.

The Court of Appeals made that point that the fact that retailers, whether or not authorized and whether or not directed by North American, the fact that retailers are continuing to misuse the Pac-Man mark is important as a matter of law, so I would submit this entire line of testimony is irrelevant for purposes of this remand.

THE COURT: The objection will be overruled.

Let's proceed.

MR. BEGGS: May I have that response back.

(Record read.)

BY MR. BEGGS:

Q So as far as you know, Mr. Frederico, does
Minnesota Fats normally refer to K. C. Munchkin and Pac-Man
in the same ads for Odyssey?

A No.

Q What is the policy of Minnesota Fats and Showtime Video on that?

A That if a game is ever advertised, it is merely for classification purposes and that we sell the game on

its own merits.

So far as -- Miss Wagner reports to you, is that correct?

A She normally reports to Michael Friedman, but in his absence she reports to me.

Q Did you clear this ad from her?

A No.

MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, if I may, I would like to hand up a copy of the document we have just been talking about.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BEGGS: And I'm about to inquire of the witness on Exhibit 28, which is another ad. I would like to hand up a copy of that now also and I have just given a copy to opposing counsel.

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

16

18

19 20

21

22 23

25

24

Q Mr. Frederico, I show you a document which purports to be a copy of an ad we have just marked as Defendants' Exhibit 28 for identification, and I also show you a page from the Chicago Tribune dated March 12, 1962.

Is Exhibit 28 a copy of the ad which appeared in the Chicago Tribune on that day?

A Yes.

Q Is that a Minnesota Fats ad, the March 12 ad?

A Yes.

What changes, with respect to the advertising of the Magnavox Video System, do you see between Exhibit 28, the March 12 ad, and Exhibit 27, which is the March 4 ad?

Well, there is no reference to K. C. Munchkin whatsoever.

Q : . How did that come about?

A I was notified by Magnavox that we should discontinue that practice.

Q What practice are you referring to?

A Of comparing K. C. Munchkin to Pac-Man in any way whatsoever.

And does this Exhibit 28 reflect the change in practice of Minnesota Fats?

A Yes.

MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, I am about to inquire of the witness on our next exhibit, Exhibit 29,

and I would like to pass a copy to the Court.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. BEGGS:

Mr. Frederico, I show you a copy of a document which purports to be an ad for Showtime Video which we have just marked as Defendants' Exhibit 29, and I also show you a copy of, a page from the Chicago Tribune dated March 4, 1982.

Is Exhibit 29 a copy of the Showtime Video ad that appeared on March 4 in the Chicago Tribune?

A Yes.

Were the circumstances of this Showtime Video ad for March 4, which we have just marked as Defendants' Exhibit 29, the same as you referred to and described earlier in your testimony with respect to the Minnesota Fats ad that appeared on March the 4th?

A Yes.

Q Was that ad of Showtime Video, which you have in front of you, Defendants' Exhibit 29, the one on March 12 -- I am sorry -- the one on March 4, was that subsequently changed?

A Yes.

MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, I am about to ask the witness on our next document which we have just marked Defendants' Exhibit 30 for identification.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. BEGGS:

Mr. Frederico, I show you a copy of a document which we have just marked Defendants' Exhibit 30 for identification and also, a page from the Chicago Tribune dated March 12, 1982.

Is the exhibit, Defendants' Exhibit 30, a copy of a Showtime Video ad that appeared in the Chicago Tribune on March the 12th, 1982?

**%** 

A 'Yes.

3

4

6

5

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

Does the Showtime Video ad, Defendants'
Exhibit 30, reflect the change that you referred to a moment ago in the advertising of Showtime Video from the March 4 ad?

A Yes, 1t does.

Were the circumstances that you described in your testimony earlier about changing the form of the advertise-ments for March 12 -- from March 4 to March 12 on the Minnesota Fats set of ads, are those the same set of circumstances applicable to those two Showtime Video ads, Defendants' Exhibit 29 and 30?

A Yes.

. MR. BEGGS: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Cross examination.

MR. VITTUM: Thank you, your Honor.

#### CROSS EXAMINATION

## BY MR. VITTUM:

Mr. Frederico, does Minnesota Fats have any affiliation with a video retailer by the name of Video, Etc. in Deerfield and Skokie?

A No.

Q Does Minnesota Fats have any affiliation with a video retailer known as American Sales in Ridgeview?

A No.

O Does Minnesota Fats have any affiliation with

Purk Magnevox?

A No.

Q Does Minnesota Fats --

MR. BEGGS: I am going to object to this continued line of questioning, your Honor, unless there is some relevancy to counsel's questions.

THE COURT: What is the -- he wasn't asked about any of these others.

MR. VITTUM: Correct, your Honor. The point defendants were making was defendant North American had not authorized any of the advertising actions of Minnesota Fats. I am pointing out there is no relationship between Minnesota Fats and other retailers for which confusion evidence was provided at the original hearing.

I have only two more to complete the record.

MR. BEGGS: I don't see how that's relevant.

THE COURT: We will see. The objection is

overruled. We will hear the argument afterwards.

Go ahead.

## BY MR. VITTUM:

Q Does Minnesota Fats have any affiliation with Video Track retailer in South Holland?

A No.

4 5

Mr. Frederico, your testimony was that between the time of the March 4 advertisements, which were Defendants' Exhibits 27 and 29, and the advertisements that appeared in the March 12 Chicago Tribune, Defendants' Exhibits 28 and 30, for identification, you were able to effect a change in the contents of the advertising insofar as it pertained to the Magnavox Odyssey system, is that correct?

A Yes.

You were able to effect that change in advertising within that very short period of time without difficulty, isn't that correct?

A Yes.

Q Your testimony with respect to Defendants' .

Exhibit 27 was that Atari paid for the ad, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Did Atari pay for the entire ad?

A No.

Atari did not pay for the advertising of the Magnavox Odyssey portion of the advertisement, is that correct?

A Yes.

You indicated that Minnesota Fats was instructed by North American Philips or Magnavox to change the reference in the advertising to Pac-Man, isn't that correct?

A . Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Didn't they indicate to you that that change should be made because it was improper to refer to Pac-Man in the advertising with respect to K. C. Munchkin?

A Yes.

Q Isn't it a fact that that is the second accasion at which Minnesota Fats was instructed by North American Philips or Magnavox to stop referring to Pac-Man in the advertising for K. C. Munchkin?

A Yes.

The other occasion was back in late November, early December, wasn't it?

A I believe so.

Q You are familiar, are you not, Mr. Frederico, that the Atari Pac-Man cartridge is now being introduced?

A Yes.

Q Has Minnesota Fats run any advertising for the Atari Pac-Man cartridge?

A Yes.

With the Atari Pac-Man cartridge, aren't you?

A Yes.

The nature of your advertising, sir, wea, in effect, that Minnesota Fats will have the Atari Fac-Man cartridge in early April but the consumer can come in and buy the cartridge from Minnesota Fats now and have their name taken and be called when the product finally arrives on the shelves, isn't that right?

Martin and the second

2

3 4

5

6

7

9

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. BEGGS: I object to the long question, your Honor, particularly since it started out something about the nature of the advertising.

MR. VITTUM: I'll rephrase, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, the question is withdrawn. Rephrase the question.

## BY MR. VITTUM:

Mr. Frederico, would you describe the basic message conveyed by the Minnesota Fats advertising for the Atari Pac-Man cartridge?

> MR. BEGGS: So far as he intends, your Honor. THE COURT: . Of course, that's the only extent the witness can testify. Yes, that's understood, isn't it?

MR. VITTUM: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right, proceed.

## BY THE WITNESS:

That if a customer gives us a pre-order which is registering to purchase the cartridge in advance of its release date, that they will be assured to get it as soon as 1t does come out. BY MR. VITTUM:

- During what period of time did you run that advertising for the Atari Pac-Man cartridge?
  - A I don't remember the exact dates. I believe it

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

18

21

20

22

24

24

25

was about a week or two ago.

- It was the period before you started advertising
  - A I believe so. . I'm not really sure.
  - Is K. C. Munchkin a Pac-Man type game?
  - A Yes.
  - Q .. Is K. C. Munchkin Odyssey's Pac-Man?
    - A No.
  - A You're aware that retail clerks in your store have so described it, are you not?
    - MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, there is no testimony
      on what his awareness of what --

THE COURT: I'm going to sustain that objection for the reason it goes way beyond the scope of the direct. His direct examination was limited to these advertisements. The objection is sustained.

## BY MR. VITTUM:

- marked for identification as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 21.
  - A Your Honor, may I hand up a copy of this.

Mr. Frederico, did you receive a copy of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 21 for identification, a document

addressed to "Dear Odyssey Dealer"?

A . Yes.

Q When did you receive it?

2

- A Last week.
- Q Do you recall what day?
- A No.

MR. VITTUM: No further questions, your Honor.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. REGGS:

- Mr. Frederico, how does Minnesota Fats divide in its own mind a dollar payment that applies to an advertisement that you put in the paper?
- A The line space of the newspaper ad that's taken up by a particular vendor gets charged back that amount.
- Q. Is that the way Minnesota Fats does it in its accounting?
  - A Yes.
- Q And so that the upper portion of that ad on March 4th -- or at least any portions here that refer to Atari out of that whole ad, those were the portions that Atari paid for or intended to pay for, is that correct?

A Yes.

THE COURT: Is there an objection?

MR. VITTUM: I am going to object on grounds of relevance, your Honor, but if counsel is finished with the line --

THE COURT: All right, go ahead.

3

4

5

6

8

7

10

9

11

13

12

14

15

16

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

4/2 12

MR. BEGGS: I'm finished with 1t, your Honor.
BY MR. BEGGS:

Did you understand what Mr. Vittum referred to when he asked you something like this: Is reference to Pac-Man in an Odyssey advertisement for K. C. Munchkin improper?

Did you understand what he meant by the term "improper"?

A No, not exactly.

MR. BEGGS: No further questions.

THE COURT: Any further questions?

20

22

25 | 10:00 o'clo

MR. VITTUM: Yes.

RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. VITTUM:

Mr. Frederico, you were told by North American Philips that reference to Pac-Man in a K. C. Munchkin ad was improper?

A ' . After the ad ran?

Q Yes.

A Yes, I was told that.

MR. VITTUM: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else of this witness?

MR. BEGGS: May I have just a moment, please?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Brief pause.)

MR. BEGGS: Nothing else from this witness.

THE COURT: All right, thank you, Mr. Frederico.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Your next witness? You gentlemen remember that I told you that at a few minutes to 10:00 o'clock we will have to adjourn these proceedings.

MR. BEGGS: I'll move as quickly as I can.

THE COURT: I am just telling you. I'm not

rushing you. We will just have to come back to this,

because I couldn't postpone the other case I had set for

10:00 o'clock.

2

3

5

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

All right, let's proceed.

MR. BEGGS: I would like to call Ms. Dawn Wagner, please, as the next witness for the defendant.

THE COURT: Come forward and be sworn.

(Witness sworn.)

THE CLERK: Be seated, please, state your name, spell your name, lean forward, speak directly into that microphone, keep your voice up.

## DAWN WAGNER,

called as a witness by the defendants herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. BEGGS:

- Q Will you please state your name and address.
- A My name is Dawn Wagner, D-a-w-n, W-a-g-n-e-r, 1110 64th Street, LaGrange, Illinois.
- Q Are you employed, Ms. Wagner?
- A Yes, I am.
- Q By whom?
  - A Roselle Industries.
    - Q What is your position there?
- A Advertising manager.
- Q Does that relate to any particular companies?
  - A Yes, I do the advertising for Minnesota Fats and

for Showtime Video.

- How long have you been in that position?
- A Three weeks.

- Whom do you report to?
- A I report to Michael Friedman. For the last two weeks I have been reporting to Vincent Frederico in Michael's absence.
- Q, I show you the Tribune ads for March 4, 1982 and -- which is Defendants' Exhibit 27, and I ask you what was Defendants' Exhibit 27, what was your connection, if anything, with the March 4th ad of Minnesota Fats?
  - A I put the ad together.
- Q Did you receive instructions to put it together?
- Mr. Frederico instructed me to take a look at previous ads because I was so new and pretty much take what I found from these ads to put the March 4th ad together.
- Then what did you do? Did you follow those instructions?
- A Yes, I did.
- Now, is there any particular reason that you know of for the phrase which appears in Defendants' Exhibit 27, "Odyssey lets you play Pac-Man now with K. C. Munchkin":
- A Well, as I said, I looked at previous ads and I did find an ad that said "K. C. Munchkin, a Fac-man type

a little snappier.

Well, have you played K. C. Munchkin?

A No, I haven't.

Q Have you seen it?

A No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Were you aware of any instructions that a reference to Pac-Man should or should not be made in ads for K. C. Munchkin?

A No, I wasn't.

Have you received any instructions since the time of that ad, March 4th?

A Yes.

Q From whom?

A From Mr. Frederico.

Q What were those instructions?

A Not to do that again.

Q I show you Defendants' Exhibit 28, which is the March 12th Minnesota Fats ad. Was that ad also made up by you?

A Yes, it was.

Q Is there any reference to Pac-Man and any material connected with Odyssey?

A No.

Q Is that pursuant to the instructions you

received from Mr. Frederico?

A Yes.

I show you the advertisement dated -- which appeared March 4, 1982 for Showtime Video, Defendants' Exhibit 29. Did you make up that ad too?

A Yes, I did.

Were the circumstances which you just described with respect to the March 4th Minnesota Fats ad the same concerning the Showtime Video ad?

A Yes.

And I show you Defendants' Exhibit 30, which is the March 12, 1982 Showtime Video ad.

Did you make up that ad too?

A Yes.

Q Is this Defendants' exhibit -- are the circumstances with respect to your making up Defendants' Exhibit 30 the same as you described with respect to the March 12th Minnesota Fats ad?

A Yes.

MR. BEGGS: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Cross examination?

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, I would move to have all of this witness' testimony stricken for the same reason I argued before. This testimony has no hearing on the four elements that have to be established by the defendant to carry its burden of showing that a stay is appropriate.

3

1

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

22

24

r

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

21

22

23

25

MR. BEGGS: Our response is the same, your Honor.

THE COURT: Motion is denied.

MR. BEGGS: Thank you.

THE COURT: You are going to cross examine?

MR. SPRINGER: Yes, sir. Good morning, your Honor.

David Springer.

THE COURT: All right.

## CROSS EXAMINATION

## BY MR. SPRINGER:

Ms. Wagner, you didn't make up the earlier ads that you referred to in order to come up with the March 4 ad, did you?

A No, I was new.

Q 'You looked at old ads that other people had done?

A yes.

Q . Who did those previous ads?

A I don't know. I wasnt't there.

Q But you concluded on the basis of your review of the previous ad that it would be okay to refer to K.C. Munchkin as Odyssey's Pac-Man, right?

A Yes.

Q Now you were told at some point that it was wrong to refer to K.C. Munchkin as Odyssey's Pac-Man, weren't you?

A Yes.

Q Were you told before you made up the March 4 ad

4

8

23

that Minnesota Fats had been told back in November that it was wrong to refer to K.C. Munchkin as Odyssey's Pac-Man? A No.

Q Nobody told you that they were told back in November that it was wrong to confuse those two products? A No.

MR. BEGGS: Objection, your Honor. There is no basis.

THE COURT: Objection is sustained. Objection is sustained, and the answer is stricken.

BY MR. SPRINGER:

Now it was no problem for you, once you learned it was wrong to refer to Odyssey's game as -- strike that.

It was no problem for you to change the ads once you learned that it was wrong to refer to K.C. Munchkin as Pac-Man, isn't that right?

MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, may we have that question, please, without the preface. We have a long preface here before we get to the question which I am afraid characterizes the question.

THE COURT: There is no jury here for that purpose.

I do have a little trouble with the word "wrong." I don't understand what that word means in the context of this case.

State that for the record. As I recall,

there was a communication -- I forget the nature of the communication. I don't think the word wrong ever appeared in that communication, but if someone will show me that. Why don't you get that communication.

MR. VITTUM: Just one moment, your Honor.

BY MR. SPRINGER:

Well, you understand that something that is improper is wrong, don't you?

A Yes.

~<sup>9</sup>

MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, I guess that's a general question, but --

THE COURT: I am going to sustain the objection.

Let's look at the letter and see what the letter says.

Wagner - cross MR. SPRINGER: I can rephrase the question, 1 your Honor. the same of the sa THE COURT: Why don't you rephrase the question 3 so we can finish the witness. 4 BY MR. SPRINGER: 5 At some point did you learn that it was improper 6 THE RESERVE TO SHARE SHEET THE to refer to K. C. Munchkin as a Pac-Man game? Didn't you? 7 THE RESERVE TO SERVE THE PARTY OF THE PARTY A 'Yes. 8 MR. BEGGS: Same objection, your Honor, unless he 9 is going to what the witness' circumstances were 10 on thinking of this kind. 11 THE COURT: Well, this witness has described 12 NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY AND PERSONS ASSESSED. her situation. She became a new employee. She was 13 Marine Contract of the Contrac told to prepare an ad. 14 TANK OF THE RESERVE OF THE PERSON OF THE PER She went to the old .ad, and she looked at 15 them and she prepared this one. She didn't know 16 anything about these communications prior to March 4, 17 1982 . 18 MR. VITTUM: Excuse me, your Honor. The 19 communication that was sent to the dealers by Odyssey 20 was a defendants' exhibit that was in evidence from 21 last fall. I don't have copies of the record, 22 defendants' exhibits. DALLES OF RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF THE PART 23 MR. BEGGS: Our exhibits are still in the 24 Court of Appeals. 25

5

8

13

15

14

16

17

19

21

20

22

24

25

MR. VITTUM: You didn't save any copies?

MR. BEGGS: We didn't bring a set of copies.

MR. VITTUM: I am sorry. I have found a copy, your Honor.

THE COURT: What is the letter?

MR. BEGGS: Excuse me. I may be in error.
Which one are you referring to?

MR. VITTUM: Defendants' Exhibit 26.

MR. BEGGS: 26?

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, may I hand you a copy of Defendants' Exhibit 22 in evidence.

THE COURT: This is the letter, isn't that right?

MR. VITTUM: That's correct.

THE COURT: Let's take a look at it and see.

See what it says.

MR. BEGGS: 22?

MR. VITTUM: 22 and 26 are the same.

THE COURT: You see, you read this letter and you don't get any context of the word wrong in this letter. I don't anyway. Nor do I get any meaning of this letter as importing or suggesting impropriet of any kind.

This letter is written by defendants'

general counsel telling them that "It is our position
that we must insist that you not make any reference

in this letter.

The word wrong has a certain imputation just as the word improper has. I don't know how you are going to phrase this question to keep away from the problem I detect in the phrasing of the question, but lack at the letter and let's strictly follow the spirit and intent of the letter.

#### BY MR. SPRINGER:

Ms. Wagner, at some point you were told to stop referring to K. C. Munchkin in connection with Pac-Man, weren't you?

%

NAME AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY.

A' Yes.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

And after you were told that, it was no problem for you to change the Minnesota Fats and the Showtime video ads to delete all references to Pac-Man in connection with K.C. Munchkin, isn't that right?

A Yes.

You could do that on a short period of time with the minimal amount of cost to you, right?

A Yes.

MR. SPRINGER: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any further questions?

MR. BEGGS: No further questions.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Wagner. All right.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Your next witness.

MR. BEGGS: We would like to call Ms. Hunton, please, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Hunton, come forward.

LINDA HUNTON,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Be seated, please. State your full name, spell your last name, lean forward and speak directly into that microphone. Please keep your voice up.

#### DIRECT EXAMINATION

#### BY MR. BEGGS:

- Would you state your full name and address, please.
- THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER, THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER, THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER, THE OWN My name is Linda Hunton. I live at 215 East the party with me of the Desirement Land Chestnut, Chicago. the African Trees Steamer I am advant All Std Africa.
  - Are you employed?
  - A , Yes, I am. THE R. CO. LEWIS CO., LANSING, MICH.
    - And what is your position? THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN 2 IS NOT THE OWNER, THE OWNE
- I am a legal secretary at Newman, Williams, Anderson and Olson.
  - And how long has that been? THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER, NAMED AND ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, NAMED AND POST OFFICE ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, NAMED AND POST OFFI ADDRESS OFFI ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, NAMED AND POST OFFI ADDRESS OFFI ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, NAMED AND POST OFFI ADDRESS OFFI ADDRE
  - A little bit more than three years. CHARLE PRODUCT SCHOOL SEC. TO THE OWNER, STREET STREET, STREET
  - Did you have occasion, to purchase a Pac-Man THE RESERVE THE PARTY OF THE PA cartridge, recently? IN THE PERSON NAMED AND POST OFFICE ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF
    - Yes, I did,
    - CALLED STREET, and Live Land Street Address of the land of the lan Were you instructed to do so? the contract that the party of
      - Yes, I was. A
      - W. Commercial Commerci When was that? THE WOLL IN PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER, THE PERSON NAMED IN
      - On Saturday. Line SHERRISHMEN
      - This past Saturday? This past Saturday, Q

    - NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, WHEN PERSON NAMED IN Who instructed you to? NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, WHEN

    - Mr. Anderson who is sitting at counsel table here? Yes.

ASSESSMENT NAME OF PERSONS

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

r

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

Ka

19

20

22

23

24

25

What were the instructions that you received?

A He showed me a copy of an advertisement from a Pacific Stereo from the Chicago Tribune, asked me to call the local stores and see if they had a Pac-Man cartridge, and if they did, to go and purchase it.

MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, I am about to ask the witness about this advertisement. I will pass a copy up to the Court.

We have just marked it as Defendants'
Exhibit 31 for identification.

#### BY MR. BEGGS:

Q Ms. Hunton, I show you a newspaper page from the Chicago Tribune dated Friday, March 12, 1982 and I hand you the exhibit that we have just marked as Defendants' Exhibit 31 for identification and ask you whether 31 is a copy of the Pacific Stereo ad that appeared in the Chicago Tribune there and is the ad you just referred to?

A Yes, it is.

Q Did you -- you said you then went there and purchased the cartridge?

A I telephoned the store in the New Town area and ascertained if they had the cartridge available, and then took a cab there and bought the cartridge.

What did you do with the cartridge after you bought it?

A When I returned at the office, I gave it to Mr. James Williams.

T

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

MR. BEGGS: And I will represent, your Honor, that our office has had the cartridge in its possession ever since. If we need to tie that up, I guess we can.

## Is there any objection?

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, I am not sure I am entirely clear about what the purpose of this entire interrogation is of this witness.

THE COURT: Why don't we wait. Maybe we will find out.

MR. VITTUM: All right.

THE COURT: After all, they have a right to proceed with the evidence.

MR. BEGGS: The point is --

THE COURT: If they don't get to the point you think they should reach, we'll see it at that time.

Proceed now. The question is being raised whether it's necessary to call any witnesses to show that that is the cartridge that this witness said she purchased. Why don't you show it to her. Maybe she can recognize the cartridge, the package.

Is there any dispute about this?

MR. VITTUM: No, sir. Not at all.

THE COURT: There is no dispute about it. It is conceded that is the cartridge the witness said she

purchased on March 12, 1982.

Let's proceed now.

MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, we will mark the cartridge, which is now shaking out of the inside of the box, as Defendants' Exhibit 32.

THE COURT: All right.

' MR. BEGGS: Your Honor, we will mark the box that it came in as Defendants' Exhibit 33.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BEGGS: And we will also mark the catalog which was inside the box as Defendants' Exhibit 34 and the instruction booklet which was inside the box as Defendants' Exhibit 35.

## BY MR. BEGGS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

- Now, Ms. Hunton, within the last 18 hours or so have you had occasion to investigate the availability of a Pac-Man cartridge in any store in Chicago?
  - A Yes, I have.
  - Q When was that?
  - A That was yesterday evening.
  - O Were you instructed to do so?
  - A Yes, I Was.
  - Q Who gave you those instructions?
  - A You did.
  - And what were those instructions?

013 17

A You asked me to call a K-Mart store located on South Pulaski Avenue and inquire if they had any Pac-Man cartridges.

Q What did you do, if anything, to carry those instructions out?

A I looked up the phone number, called the store and asked that question.

What was your understanding when you asked that question of what the situation was at the store?

A The person I spoke to said they had received the cartridges Friday night or Friday, and by Friday night they had about three left and they were sold out by Saturday, and if I called back the end of the week that she could probably tell me when and if they would be getting more.

MR. BEGGS: One moment, your Honor.

MR. BEGGS: No further questions.

THE COURT: Any cross examination?

MR. VITTUM: None, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Hunton.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: We have just a little less than ten minutes. Do you want to start with a witness?

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, we can stop right new.

The next witness would be -- we asked for Mr. Moone. I understand that he is not being produced, but Mr. Paul is.

It might take more than ten minutes, so if you would like to adjourn now --

THE COURT: You may stay if you wish. We will just have to watch and see what happens with the case I'm going to call at 10:00 o'clock.

MR. BEGGS: I have one thing. Mr. Frederico and Ms. Wagner, if there are no further questions to be asked of them, I would like to excuse them.

THE COURT: They have been excused.

MR. BEGGS: Would 1t be proper before they go to offer our exhibits?

THE COURT: Certainly, offer the exhibits and

Exhibits 27, 28, 29 and 30, those were the

advertisements.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. VITTUM: No objection, your Hanor.

THE COURT: All right, they are admitted in

evidence.

(Said exhibits were thereupon received into evidence as Defendants' Exhibits 27, 28, 29 and 30.)

MR. BEGGS: 31, 32 -- I'm sorry --

THE COURT: You marked them 31, that's the --

31, 32, 33, and 34.

MR. VITTUM: And 35.

THE COURT: And 35.

MR. VITTUM: No objection.

THE COURT: And 35.

MR. VITTUM: No objection.

THE COURT: They are admitted in evidence. (Said exhibits were thereupon received

into evidence as Defendants' Exhibits

31, 32, 33, 34 and 35.)

THE COURT: All right, we will adjourn and reconvene soon after I finish with the other case.

(Recess taken.)

21

22

23

have Mr. Moone appear here today as a witness called by the defendants and we understand that the plaintiffs are not producing Mr. Moone but instead are producing Mr. Charles S. Paul.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. VITTUM: That is correct.

The Part of the Pa

MR. ANDERSON: We will call that witness at

this time.

(Witness sworn.)

THE CLERK: Be seated, please, and state your name, speak your name, lean forward, speak to that microphone, keep your voice up.

THE WITNESS: My name is Charles S. Faul. Last name is spelled P-a-u-1.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Paul is being called as an adverse witness.

CHARLES S. PAUL,

called as an adverse witness by the defendants herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ANDERSON:

on November 25, 1981 on behalf of the plaintiffs, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Will you please again state what your position is with Atari?

A I'm senior vice president and general counsel of the corporation.

I would like to hand you Defendants' Exhibits 32, 33, 34 and 35. Can you identify those as a product of Atari?

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

21

20

22

24

23

25

A Defendants' Exhibit 32 appears to be a Pac-Man cartridge for use with the Atari video computer system.

Defendants' Exhibit 33 appears to be a package in which that cartridge may have been delivered.

Defendants' Exhibits 34 and 35 appear to be catalog materials which may have been contained in that package.

- Have you seen other copies of each of the exhibits before today?
  - A I'm not sure I understand.
  - Have you seen a Pac-Man cartridge before today?
- A Yes.
- Q Is that a Pac-Man cartridge, as far as you understand it and as far as you recognize it, made by Atari?
  - A It appears similar to others I have seen.
  - O Do you have any reason to believe it isn't?
  - A No.
- With respect to the carton and the catalog and the instruction manual, is that also true, they appear to be products of Atari?
- A They appear to be similar to others that I have seen, right.
- In November when you testified Atari was not shipping Pac-Man cartridges, is that correct?

- I believe that's correct, yes.
  - Atari is now selling and shipping Fac-Man cartridges, is that correct?
  - A That's correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- In fact, Pac-Man cartridges are now being sold in Chicago, is that correct?
  - A As far as I know.
  - Q And in St. Louis?
  - A As far as I know.
  - Q And in Houston?
  - A I believe they are being sold nationwide.
- Recourt and Company by Atari, is that correct?
  - A That's correct.
  - Q And to J. C. Penney, is that correct?
    - A That is also correct.
    - Q And to the K-Mart, is that correct?
    - A I believe that's also correct, yes.
- And none of those companies have refused to buy or rejected the purchase of Pac-Man cartridges, is that correct?
  - A Not to my knowledge.

75.19

2

3

4

5

6

8

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

20

22

23

25

Fac-Man cartridges to the public, as far as you know?

A I have seen the advertisements from each of those retailers, yes.

- How many Pac-Man cartridges have been shipped so far by Atari?
- A I believe in excess of one million units.
- Q And those are all sold also, is that right?
  - A Yes.
  - Q When were they first shipped by Atari?
- A I believe the cartridges were first available at retail on Monday of last week. This is the very beginning of our product introduction.
- Is it correct that the most popular cartridge prior to Pac-Man was Space Invaders?
  - A In terms of what?
  - Q Sales, units.
- A I'm not sure. It's very close.
  - Q Very close to what?
- A I don't know what the prior leader in sales was to Pac-Man, no.
- Q But your Space Invaders was one of the leaders:
- A Was one of the most popular.
- Q Is it correct that you shipped more Pac-Man

entire year, your best year?

- A I'm not sure.
- That was reported in the Wall Street Journal for March 12, 1981, and I'll mark a copy of that as Defendants' Exhibit 36.

Mr. Paul, I refer you to the first column, the second paragraph under "word of mouth waiting list," where the article states a quotation:

"'We'll ship more Pac-Man cartridges in
the first month than Space Invaders sold in the first
year,' says a Warner executive. More than one
million Space Invader cartridges were sold in that
first year."

Warner is the parent company of Atari, is it not?

- A That's correct.
- Does this refresh your recollection at all with respect to any information in that regard?
- A ... This doesn't refresh my recollection. I will explain if I may. I don't know who a Warner executive was that may have said this. I also believe in reading this that my prior answer that we sold more than one million units is consistent with this statement.

Q Thank you.

Now in the same Wallstreet Journal article in the third column, the middle of the page, there is a paragraph that starts, "Mr. Bell says he never before has seen the likes of consumer response to Pac-Man."

In St. Louis ads announcing the arrival last Saturday' by 10:30 a.m. last Saturday, one St. Louis store ran out of games and the other two were out by noon.

In Chicago ads run in Wednesday evening's paper, "By 10:00 a.m. yesterday, Sears had sold out."

Is that correct as far as you know?

MR. VITTUM: Objection, your Honor. I don't know that the proper foundation has been laid to ask a question of this witness with respect to those hearsay --

THE COURT: He is only asking him if this is true.

If he knows whether it's true or not, he can say so.

THE WITNESS: I do not know whether that is true.

I do know, however, this is a critical period of product introduction which this article clearly implies.

THE COURT: All right.

#### BY MR. ANDERSON:

- Q Do you have any reason to think it's untrue?
- A I don't believe everything I read in the press.
- Q Can you answer the question?
- A No, I don't.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

Paul - direct

1

or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Paul, is it true that J.C. Penney Company has run a Pac-Man promotion or is running a Pac-Man promo-4- 11-51 tion which is their largest retail promotion for the entire year with respect to any product?

J. C. Penney's promotion that has been planned for the Pac-Man cartridge will be very close to their largest for this year of any product. It's very important to J. C. Penney. They are very interested.

What is Atari's present production for Pac-Man cartridge sales for the next months?

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, may I at this point interpose an objection. The amount or extent of Atari's success with the popular --

THE COURT: That objection will be sustained. Let's get down to a showing of why this injunction should be stayed.

Now that objection is sustained.

## BY MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Paul, from your knowledge of the home video market, is it correct that Atari has captured about 80 percent of that market followed by Mattel's Intellevision with roughly 15 percent and Magnavox's Odyssey with 3 or 4 percent?

MR. VITTUM: Objection, your Honor. That

also is irrelevant, I would submit.

THE COURT: Objection is sustained.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, may I address that?

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. ANDERSON: I think that is definitely relevant on the question of irreparable harm, potential injury, relative balance of the injury between the two parties.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear the question again, in view of that.

Would you read the question.

(Record read.)

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, I still submit that's irrelevant to the narrow issues that are before the Court on remand. The question of Atari's relative size to that of the defendant Odyssey has no relevance as to the particular effect the injunction dealing with K.C. Munchkin would have, and that's the only issue that's before the Court.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Monor, that's tantamount to saying that it's not relevant whether the elephant can --

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. Let's proceed. The only way I am going to resolve this matter is to hear evidence.

Go ahead now.

BY MR. ANDERSON:

- Q Will you please answer the question, Mr. Paul.
- A Sir, I have no idea what the relevant market or the relative market shares are.

Mr. Paul, we asked to have Mr. Moone here today.
Why was Mr. Moone not produced at our request to testify
here today as the executive in charge of the Atari home
video market?

A This is a very important day for Atari. It is the day that in New York City all the Warner communication executives and Mr. Moone, as President of our Consumer Division, are announcing to the press the type of promotion that we will do for Pac-Man. It is a critical day.

It is the beginning of the largest product promotion and role-out in our company's history, and Mr. Moone is there to announce to the press the types of support and the types of advertising that they will be seeing.

Q And that was more important than complying with our request, is that correct?

MR. VITTUM: Objection, your Monor. That's an argumentative question.

THE COURT: Objection will be sustained. Why don't you ask this witness questions, and if he can answer it, you make a showing that Mr. Moone can answer the question and let's see what they are.

MR. ANDERSON: I will have the reporter mark as Defendants' Exhibit 37 an article --

MR. VITTUM: May I have one, Mr. Anderson?

MR. ANDERSON: It's an article -- would you like

T

BY MR. ANDERSON:

I show you, Mr. Paul, an article from the Chicago Tribune for Monday, March 8, 1982 appearing in Section 5 and I call your attention to the third column, the first full paragraph, in the middle of the paragraph where it states, "Atari has captured about 80 percent of the market followed by Mattel's Intellevision with about 15 percent and Magnavox's Odyssey with 3 to 4 percent."

Is that any way inconsistent with information available and considered by Atari in the course of marketing home video games?

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, the witness has already testified that he does not have any idea as to the subject matter of that question. I am not sure how this interrogation --

THE COURT: Let's see what Mr. Paul would say.

MR. VITTUM: All right.

with the second contract of the last of th

NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, WHEN

THE COURT: Objection is overruled.

2

K

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

21

20

22

23 24

25

THE WITNESS: Could you ask the question again, NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, WHEN PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN 2 IS NOT THE OWNER, THE OWNER, THE PERSON NAMED IN please.

no the of the sourced of expensional to hardware the same MR. ANDERSON: Would you read the question.

> (Record read.) NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, OF TAXABLE PARTY.

## BY THE WITNESS:

Committee of the Course will be a first party of the course of the cours Atari does not consider market shares in its the same of the later which the party of the later of the marketing plans of its product. 

#### BY MR. ANDERSON:

THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF T Has Atari ever had access to any market share note the same of t data? OR DEPOSITE TAKEN STORED OF THE PARTY OF

Occasionally, market share information appears in articles like this.

Has Atari ever done any investigation at all of market shares? CHARLES THE RESERVE OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER.

A Not to my knowledge, and I believe I would have known.

Mr. Paul, is it correct that the Pac-Man cartridge introduction today has been received in the marketplace AND RESIDENCE THE PARTY OF PERSONS ASSESSED. THE PARTY OF with considerable enthusiasm?

There is a heightened sense of excitement antici-pating the product introduction, yes. The second state of the se

Now as you understand the subject matter on which you have been called here to testify, if Magnavox continues to sell the Odyssey K.C. Munchkin cartridge, based upon many and the extremental bear done has made to be a the best information you have on market shares, to what I REPLECIAL THE PROPERTY OF AN ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF TH

extent would that reduce the sales of the Pac-Man cartridges, as far as any studies or investigation or facts that you have developed and been shown?

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, I object to the question insofar as it refers to a foundation to market share data. If he wants to ask the witness what effect continued sales of K.C. Munchkin will have on Atari's marketing of the Pac-Man cartridge, that's appropriate.

THE COURT: Will you accept that suggestion?

MR. ANDERSON: I will withdraw the question,

your Honor.

THE COURT: Question is withdrawn. Proceed.

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Paul, doesn't Atari expect that the continued market reception and enthusiasm for Pac-Man will be the same as you have experienced so far?

A We expect Pac-Man to be the largest selling cartridge in our company's history. However, if I may explain, there is confusion in the marketplace, presently.

Q Mr. Paul, do you have some documentary basis for your statement that there is confusion in the marketplace?

A Conversations I have had with important buyers, conversations I had with people in our Marketing and Sales Group and the adjustments that Atari has made in its advertising to stress -- we are now having to stress that

2

4

5

7

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

24

25

Pac-Man comes only from Atari.

This is a message we are having to convey to combat confusion from the consumers seeing K.C. Munchkin and Pac-Man in the market together.

- Q Do you have any documentation of that aspect?
- A A piece of paper?
- Q A piece of paper, yes.
- A No, I don't have a piece of paper.
- Q Anything from a customer that's indicated that?
- A Direct conversations I have had with the senior buyers of Sears Roebuck yesterday, Mr. Dick Leerberg.
  - Q Do you have a document? If no --
  - A No, I don't.
  - Q There is no such thing?
- A No such document that I know of.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, that concludes the direct examination.

THE COURT: All right. Cross examination.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, we have no cross examination of Mr. Paul. We do intend to reserve the right to call him as our own witness at an appropriate time.

THE COURT: All right. You are excused, Mr. Paul.

Your next witness.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

MR. ANDERSON: I call Mr. Ralph Staup as our next witness, your Honor.

THE COURT: Come forward and be sworn.

While this witness is coming to the stand,

I want to tell the lawyers in this case that most likely

we will have to adjourn these proceedings at 11:00 o'clock

and reconvene at 2:00.

## RALPH STAUP,

called as a witness on behalf of the defendants, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Be seated, please. State your full name, spell your last name, lean forward and speak directly into that microphone and keep your voice up.

THE WITNESS: My name is Ralph William Staup, and that last name is spelled S-t-a-u-p.

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Staup, did you testify in these proceedings last November?

A Yes, sir.

Will you please again state your position with North American Philips Consumer Electronics Corporation.

A My position is vice president of product development for the Odyssey division.

Will you please describe for us, Mr. Staup, what plans, if any, the Odyssey division now has to advertise the K. C. Munchkin game.

A From here forward?

Q From here forward.

A We have no plans for the foreseeable future to spend any national advertising dollars on the K. C. Munchkin cartridge.

Have you budgeted any funds at all for national advertising or any advertising?

A For K. C. Munchkin?

Q For K. C. Munchkin.

A No, sir.

Q. In your opinion, Mr. Staup, will the presence of K. C. Munchkin on the market have any impact on the sales of Atari or Atari's Pac -Man cartridge?

3

1

5

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

cartridge?

A I am sorry. Would you repeat that.

What information, from the investigations and studies of Odyssey, would you have for estimating the offect on the market or the impact on the sales of Atari or Atari's Pac-Man cartridges which will result from the cantinued, sale of K. C. Munchkin cartridges?

A I think the best information I would have there is the fact that I think as Mr. Paul has said, they expect to ship a million cartridges in the first month.

There is other information in the press that estimates that their sales will be on the order of nine million --

MR. VITTUM: Objection, your Honor.

#### BY THE WITNESS:

A -- cartridges.

THE COURT: Why don't you wait until the witness finishes answering.

MR. VITTUM: I apologize.

THE COURT: Move against the answer.

Finish your answer, Mr. Staup.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A I know what our sales forecast is for the K. C. Munchkin cartridge for the balance of the year, and doing

a simple long division, I come up with our sales of K.C. Munchkin which would be four or five percent of the sales of

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, objection to the extent that it relies on hearsey sources for sales of Pac-Man.

MR. ANDERSON: I think, your Honor, that that's the nature --

THE COURT: That may be the best source of information. You know, despite what we say about hearsay, sometimes it may be the only information we have.

No, the objection is overruled. Let it stand, and we are going to have to look at it in its entirety. Go ahead.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, your Honor. No further direct examination.

THE COURT: All right, cross examination.

CROSS EXAMINATION

### BY MR. VITTUM:

Would your mathematical calculation, Mr. Staup, of 4 or 5 percent, would that translate to about 360,000 units of K. C. Munchkin approximately?

- A on an annual basis?
- Q Yes, sir.
  - or for the balance of the year?
  - Balance of the year. I believe that was what

your calculation was, wasn't it?

A I'm sorry, I don't have my calculator. I'm
not very good at it in my head either. About 4 percent,
I think, which doesn't translate to that number.

I'm trying to translate that number into an
actual number of units.

No, the actual number of units left to sell yet this year is considerably less than that in our sales forecast.

The number I'm looking for is the total number of sales of K. C. Munchkin for the year.

A For the year?

Q Yes.

A Yes, it's similar to that number.

Q About 360,000 units?

A . I think it's in that order, yes, sir.

I will show you, Mr. Staup, a document which
I am marking as Plaintiff's Exhibit 22 for identification,
which is a photocopy of page 8 from the February 22, 1982
Advertising Age, and I direct your specific attention to
the point I have highlighted in yellow in the column
entitled "Last Minute News."

Let me just read it. It's only one sentence.

It says:

"NAP Consumer Electronics, Knoxville, will launch a one million-dollar local TV and cable

2

4

5

6

8

9

11

12

14

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

22

24

25

cartridge to run in Panarketa this wask,

Did that news item in Advertising Are accurately reflect North American Philips' advertising plans for K. C. Munchkin as of that time

A No, sir.

Q, What were North American's plans for advertising K. C. Munchkin at that time?

two weeks of February.

By the time this article was written, it had already been an accomplished fact and was over with.

Q You were aware, were you not, that that period of time preceded the national introduction for the Atari Pac-Man cartridge, are you not?

A Yes, sir.

Q A few minutes ago you gave an indication of the 1902 sales projections for the K. C. Munchila cartridge.

What are your projections for the sales of the Odyssey hase unit for that same period of time

A I would like to ask our counsel, do I have to answer that with members of the public here?

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, I would submit that the information is relevant because the Court of Appeals both in its original opinion and in its

March 11th order remanding pointed out the serious harm that occurs because of the relationship between the sales of the Odyssey base unit and the K. C. Munchkin cartridge. That's the purpose of my interrogation of this witness.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, I object. I think that would be an inappropriate question. If the witness can be interrogated in this area based on --

THE COURT: Suppose you let him -- no, first
the witness wants to discuss with you whether or not why don't you take a few minutes and talk with the
witness. It has been held to be error to refuse a
witness an opportunity to talk with his lawyer,
whether it is in a civil or criminal case.

Talk with the witness just a minute and resolve the matter. We will take a short recess.

NAME AND POST OF PERSONS ASSESSED FOR PERSONS ASSESSED.

(Recess taken.)

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

13

15

17

18

19

18

20

23

22

24

25

THE COURT: Avoiding only a public answer to the question, is that what you are saying?

THE WITNESS: 'Yes, sir.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You are willing to give it to

Mr. Vittum in written form in an envelope, and he can
look at it, is that what you are saying?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes. The witness --

THE COURT: What is wrong with that?

MR. VITTUM: That's fine, your Honor. I have no further questions in that line then.

THE COURT: Then proceed.

MR. VITTUM: Okay.

#### BY MR. VITTUM:

be best.

Q Mr. Staup, I believe you testified earlier to a number which I think was your calendar year 1982 sales projection for the K.C. Munchkin cartridge, and am I correct, that that was a calendar 1982 projection?

A Yes, sir. I agreed to your number and I said it was in that range.

Q I understand that. Am I correct that that did not include sales of K.C. Munchkin during 1971?

A '71, sir?

Q Excuse me. 1981.

A No, sir, it did not.

Okay. What were the sales of K. C. Munchkin cartridges during 1981?

A Again, sir, do I have to answer this with a specific number. I would be happy to write it down on a sheet of paper.

MR. VITTUM: We will take it on the same basis, your Honor.

THE COURT: Same basis. Go ahead.

BY MR. VITTUM:

Q With respect to your earlier answer, Mr. Staup, concerning the fact that North American has no present plans for national advertising, is your answer the same with respect to local forms of advertising for the K. C. Munchkin cartridge?

A Well, we don't, specifically, plan local advertising. That's given in terms of funds that are, essentially, an integral part of the sale.

In other words, a percentage of every sale that's made is, generally speaking, set aside for local advertising funds.

- G That's sales referred to as retailer cooperative advertising program?
  - A Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
- Q And the retailer then sends you in a clipping of the ad he placed, and you reimburse all or part of the cost, is that right?

  A Yes. sir.

pr

Is North American still accepting retailer cooperative advertising reimbursement requests with respect to K.C. Munchkin?

A Well, our terms of sale on co-op are standard annual terms of sale and there is nothing specifically different in K.C. Munchkin from any other part of the product line.

- You have not instructed your dealers or retailers not to advertise K.C. Munchkin cartridges at retail?
- A Not to my knowledge.
- Q In point of fact you have encouraged them to continue advertising K.C. Munchkin at retail, have you not?

A I don't know that we have specifically done that, sir.

Let me show you Plaintiff's Exhibit 21 for identification, a March 5, 1982 letter on the NAP Consumer Electronics Corp. letterhead, headed "Dear Odyssey Dealer," which in its last sentence says: "You may continue to advertise, display and sell K.C. Munchkin on its merits as a superior video game."

Does that refresh your recollection as to the position North American has taken with respect to retailer advertising of the K.C. Munchkin cartridge?

A Yes, sir, but I would not consider this to be encouraging that advertising. If we were going to encourage

Ħ

2

pr

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

25

by ourselves to run during a certain period of time.

We have nothing like that planned.

Q This letter in the third paragraph from the bottom

This letter in the third paragraph from the bottom also contains the phrase, Mr. Staup, that, and I quote:
"This means business as usual."

North American did instruct its dealers that it was "business as usual" with respect to K.C. Munchkin on March 5, 1982, which was the day this Court entered its injunction, is that correct?

A I am not sure what day this Court entered its injunction. I wasn't --

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, I object. There was no time that I know of when an injunction was in effect from this Court or any other Court that wasn't stayed. I object to the question as to form and nature of the comment.

THE COURT: As I understand it, the injunction was issued on the same day I issued the stay.

MR. VITTUM: That is correct.

THE COURT: The injunction was issued. The objection is overruled.

## BY THE WITNESS:

A I don't recall the date the injunction was --

BY MR. VITTUM:

But in any case, on March 5 North American was instructing its dealers that it was "business as usual" with respect to K.C. Munchkin?

A Yes, sir.

O There would be no problem at all involved in North American instructing its dealers that it would no longer accept retail advertising reimbursements requests with respect to K.C. Munchkin, would there?

A I don't know the answer to that. We would have to get the advertising and merchandising manager to talk about the specifics of that.

Q. If the injunction that this Court has entered were to go into effect and the stay were vacated by the Court, that action by the Court would not cause North American any problems with respect to national advertising of K.C. Munchkin, is that correct?

A No, sir.

Q That is not correct?

A I'm sorry, that is correct, it would not cause us any problems with any planned national advertising that we have for the foreseeable future.

MR. VITTUM: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Any further questions

of Mr. Staup?

4pr

Ħ

MR. ANDERSON: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

(Witness excused.)

I THE RESERVE OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER.

the state of the s

3/11/3

nī.

2

3

5

6

4

7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, that completes the witnesses that we intend to call.

I would offer in evidence Defendants! Exhibits 35 and 37, the two articles about which you interrogated Mr. Paul.

MR. VITTUM: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, 36 and 37 are admitted in evidence.

(Said exhibits were thereupon received into evidence as Defendants' Exhibits 36 and 37.)

MR. ANDERSON: I have one other exhibit that I would like to offer as Defendants' Exhibit 38, and that's an advertisement of Sears appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times for Thursday, March 11, 1982, with respect to the Pac-Man game.

MR, VITTUM: No objection.

THE COURT: Admitted in evidence.

(Said exhibit was thereupon received into evidence as Defendants' Exhibit 38.)

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me see if I understand the last question that was asked Mr. Staup and his answer, and also to put the matter into focus now since there have been so

many orders entered in this case.

The Court of Appeals in its opinion has decided what at least for the time being, assuming nothing else occurs, is the law of this case, hasn't it? Do the parties agree to that?

MR. VITTUM: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Aside from agreeing -- you don't have to agree with the Court of Appeals. I'm only asking whether it isn't true as a matter of law that the Court of Appeals has determined what is the law of this case, and until that Court of Appeals' determination is set aside or modified either by the Court of Appeals itself or by the Supreme Court of the United States, that's the law of the case, isn't it?

MR. ANDERSON: Only on the question of preliminary injunction, yes, your Honor. It is the decision of the Court of Appeals on the issue of preliminary injunction, the question of stay that is, of course, before us now and the merits. Specifically we agreed to certain things only for the purpose of the preliminary injunction, and we want to again reiterate that because I think there are many other issues that will arise.

whether a preliminary injunction should be issued, the

law of the case for that purpose -- that the K. C. Munchkin video game when ocularly compared with the Pac-Man video game is similar.

MR. VITTUM: That is correct.

THE COURT: They made that determination.

MR. VITTUM: That's correct.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You don't have to agree with the determination, but that's what they said.

MR. ANDERSON: They carved out portions that weren't and they carved out some portions that were as they saw it, and we do disagree, I might say.

THE COURT: I understand that.

Then pursuant to that I issued the injunction, stayed it.

Now, Mr. Staup, as I understand the question that was asked him, he said that if that injunction were not stayed, as I understood his answer, he said it would not adversely affect North American Philips Electronics' program of nationwide advertising for the K. C. Munchkin videogame.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, Mr. Staup testified that odyssey has no present plan or budget for national advertising in the future, and I think based on that he said that therefore the injunction would not affect a

13

11

12

15 16

17

19

20

22

23

24

plan which they don't have.

THE COURT: In other words, someone that is not going to do anything need not be enjoined.

MR. ANDERSON: But this is only the national advertising question, of course.

THE COURT: The national advertising. How about the extent to which they are selling the K. C. Munchkin game? That's a different matter, isn't it?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, your Hunor, it certainly is, and I think that's an important matter before the Court today.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. VITTUM: Has the plaintiff rested -- or excuse me, defendant rested?

MR. ANDERSON: Defendant rests, yes.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, at this time the plaintifff would move that the Court vacate the stay it entered March 5th.

Your Honor, in the remand order of
March 11th the Court of Appeals established the law
governing termination of stay. It pointed to the four
factors which the Court must take into account in
determining whether a stay is proper: A strong likelihund
that the defendants will prevail on the merits of the
appeal; irreparable injury to the defendants';no substantial

harm to the plaintiffs; and no adverse impact on the public interest.

The Court of Appeals went on to note that the defendants bore the Burden and that defendants case must be very strong for the grant of a stay of the injunction since the factors for the grant of a stay coincide with the factors that the Court of Appeals considered in the opinion it entered on the merits of the appeal.

The Court of Appeals indicated that the injunction could properly be stayed only if the District Court finds controlling circumstances not appearing in the record previously before the Court of Appeals.

We would submit, your Honor, that in the evidence presented on behalf of the defendants nothing has been advanced that would satisfy any one of the four clements before the Court, let alone all four of them.

to the likelihood of success on the merits of further review of the Court of Appeals' decision.

There has been no showing --

THE COURT: Before you do that, what is the status of the matter in the Court of Appeals?

MR. VITTUM: It is my understanding, your Honor, that the matter is still in the Court of Appeals. There has been no petition for rehearing, and the defendants have stated to the Court of Appeals that they do not intend to seek rehearing, and that instead, they intend to seek review by way of a petition for certiorari.

THE COURT: Let me think about this for a moment. Now this was an interlocutory appeal?

MR. VITTUM: That's correct.

THE COURT: And the Court of Appeals has published its opinion.

MR. VITTUM: Yes, it has.

THE COURT: Well, there is nothing else pending in the Court of Appeals since there's no petition for rehearing.

MR. VITTUM: No, your Honor, except that under the Court of Appeals rule, the mandate in the Court of Appeals is automatically stayed for 21 days. That 21 days runs out Tuesday of next week so the mandate has not come down.

MR. ANDERSON: And your Honor --

MR. VITTUM: But otherwise, you are correct. There is nothing pending in the Court of Appeals.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, we have filed a motion with

4 5

the Court of Appeals indicating that we do intend, in fact, to take this matter to the Supreme Court by petition for writ of certiorari, and certainly Rule 17, specifically, contemplates providing an opportunity to do that, and we are seeking that opportunity.

THE COURT: You have the opportunity under the rules.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, we would like, and we think
in all fairness, we should have the opportunity to do that,
to complete this appeal.

THE COURT: To do what?

MR. ANDERSON: To petition the Supreme Court without having the injunction in effect. With the ability to continue without changing, without destroying what we have in the way of sales now going, and we should be able to continue that.

That there is adequate remedy for any injury that Atari might suffer, and that they cannot show -- and the evidence here, clearly, shows that they are not suffering irreparable injury.

THE COURT: Let me ask you another question. The present posture of the matter is that there was an injunction issued, and there was a stay.

MR. VITTUM: That is correct.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor.

3

5

Horar.

10

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

THE COURT: And that's the present posture.

MR. VITTUM: That is correct, your Honor, and I am rising to move the Court to vacate the stay at this time.

MR. ANDERSON: We are opposing that motion. MR. VITTUM: If I may continue, briefly, your

I would submit that the evidentiary showing presented on behalf of the defendants does not meet the strong burden and necessity of showing controlling circumstances that the Court of Appeals, in its letter of March 11, 1902, indicated would have to be shown to entitle defendants to a stay.

Your Honor, Mr. Anderson simply just indicated that the defendants' position is that they should be entitled to a stay in the market until the Supreme Court has an opportunity to review. It is, precisely, that point that the Court of Appeals addressed when it sent it back to this Court with this hearing on the injunction that the defendants had a strong, heavy burden to establish and had to come forward with controlling circumstances not appearing in the review.

We submit that there has been no controlling circumstances. There has been no substantial showing of harm to the defendant North 'merican. Indeed, North American concedes that there's no harm to it in connection with its program for advertising K. C.

Munchkin.

THE COURT: As I understand it they are not

THE COURT: At I understand it, they are not soln; to do any nationwide advertising, but the injunction has the effect of preventing them from selling.

MR. VITTUM: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's what the whole --

MR. VITTUM: That is the precise issue before you, and it is the presence of the K. C. Munchkin cartridge on the market, on the retail shelves.

We have heard testimony this morning with respect to Minnesota Fats about how inadvertently, whereby mistake or what have you, for the second time with the very same retail company, there was an association of Pac-Man with K. C. Munchkin. Your Honor, the defendant misunderstands our point in claiming that the parent company, North American, had nothing to do with that mistake. The very point we make is that those mistakes are happening, and that is extremely injurious.

THE COURT: What is the consequence of that?
What is the injury to the plaintiff of that fact? Isn't that what really this is all about?

MR. VITTUM: Sure. A customer comes into the store, the customer is familiar with Pac-Man, and he has

seen the advertising for Atari's Pac-Man and comes into the store, such as, Minnesota Fats which has already sold out its initial shipment. Minnesota Fats said, as Mr. Frederico indicated --THE COURT: By the way, Minnesota Fats has sold out its supply of Atari. MR. VITTUM: That is correct. THE COURT: You didn't get to how many K. C. Munchkins they may have had in stock. MR. VITTUM: That's right. THE COURT: We didn't get to that. MR. VITTUM: That's right. THE COURT: All right. 

g model of a matter of process of

5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. VITTUM: A customer comes in to Mr. Frederico's store and says, "I want to buy an Atari Pac-Man." He is told, "You can sign up, pay your money and we will get you one in April." He is also told, "You can play Pac-Man now with K.C. Munchkin," and that customer who, at the height of the popularity of the Pac-Man game, buys not only the K.C. Munchkin cartridge but he buys the base unit.

The Court of Appeals in both its original opinion and in its order last week has pointed out the significance of the harm to Atari that occurs when a customer commits to the Odyssey system as a result of the extreme popularity of the Pac-Man cartridge, and the Pac-Man game which is used to sell K.C. Munchkin. That's why you have an injury that goes far beyond just the initial sale of the cartridge, your Honor.

It is the sale of an entire system, and the sale of cartridges, other cartridges, that are compatible with the other system on into the future.

Your Honor, we would submit that in terms of any public interest that is involved, another of the factors that this Court must consider, there has been no showing by the defendants that there is any public interest in favor of retaining K.C. Munchkin on the market. Quite the contrary. The philosophy of the company by the law and the trademark law suggests that the public is entitled not

to be confused, is entitled to be able to rely on a trademark, such as, Pac-Man, and to go into a store and to buy genuine, authorized licensed merchandise and not be diverted into another product, a product which the Court of Appeals and the law of the case has determined is an infringing work.

Furthermore, your Honor, we would submit that the timing of this day is of critical importance. As Mr. Paul testified, we are in the beginnings of the rollout for the Atari Pac-Man cartridge. Nationwide, the product is moving into the stores and there's retailer advertising, media advertising. Mr. Moone today is in New York at the press briefing for the national introduction of that product.

The continued presence in the marketplace of K.C. Munchkin hurts Atari.

Atari to have to restructure its advertising to emphasize that the genuine Pac-Man can only be obtained from Atari, and Atari wouldn't have to do that if K.C. Munchkin weren't present in the marketplace. K.C. Munchkin was advertised and associated with Pac-Man from its introduction in November, the Christmas season, and now during the introduction of the Pac-Man cartridge, the Court of Appeals is concerned about the irreparable injury which it found, as a matter of law, affected Atari's introduction.

The Court of Appeals sent this case back with the

instruction that only controlling circumstances, not before the Court in the record on appeal, could prevent the stay being vacated. We would submit, your Honor, that the question of whether K.C. Munchkin ought to be able to continue to be sold in the marketplace, which is the real issue before this Court, is something that was before the Court of Appeals, and it's in the record. There is nothing new about it.

So in sum, your Honor, we submit that the burden has not been met by the defendants. We believe that the stay should be vacated and furthermore, in light of the business-as-usual letter which North American rushed out to its dealers the very same day that the Court entered the injunction on March 5th, then North American should be required to circulate a corrective mailing to the Odyssey dealers informing them of the Court's action and vacating the stay and advising them of the situation as it exists accurately in the Courts at this time. Thank you, your Honor.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, the Court of Appeals, in its letter, made several points. One that we should --

THE COURT: Letter? The Court of Appeals in its letter, you said.

MR. ANDERSON: In the order of March 11, 1982 made several points that I will address, and that Mr. Vittum addressed in part, but Mr. Vittum addressed points that just aren't in issue here now, and I think tends to detract from addressing the real questions.

He discussed the trademark. There's been no evidence whatsoever of a single person that was confused on some trademark question, and he says that the trademark is to avoid confusion. We would agree, and that's why It's so clear that when Pacific Steres, for example, advertises Pac-Man in stock, that's Pac-Man and if someone wants K. C. Munchkin, they know what K. C. Munchkin is and they know it plays on an Odyssey console.

Now there are two basic points that I see raised by the order of March II of the Court of Appeals, and the first one is a reference to defendants' continued advertising. Now I believe that when plaintiff attached those two Minnesota Fats ads to its motion, somehow it led to an impression that those were defendants' advertisings. Defendant has never had a single piece of

a Lo

advertising which referred in any way to Pac-Man, and the two ads that have been used by the plaintiff were obvious mistakes of a girl who had been on the job a week and inadvertently, pulled an old ad and re-ran it and as she said, tried to improve it a little bit without any knowledge of the games, without any knowledge of the problems, and I think, you know, it is extremely important that that's just one outlet, one retailer out of thousands in the United States. 

If plaintiffs could have come in with another one today, I am sure they would have. I think that it's clear that this is just a single incident that should not act to the prejudice of the defendants here today. That's the first point. The question about defendants' continue advertising, and it just doesn't apply --

THE COURT: That part is easily taken care of.

I think the evidence shows, can be found that the

defendants are not continually advertising at a time when
plaintiff's protected product is entering the market.

I think that much comes out of the evidence.

MR. ANDERSON: Right.

Now, then the second point, of course, is the new controlling circumstance which was not before in the record before the Court of Appeals, and that

controlling circumstance is critical and basic to the situation here today. In November, Atari was not on the market. They testified that they had a substantial investment in production.

基

They had a pre-production or pre-introduction investment of a million dollars that they said would increase to \$5 million by January. In their motion for the preliminary injunction, they stated to the Court, this Court, "Unless immediately restrained and enjoined, defendant will succeed in stealing an immensely valuable market for a home video version of Pac-Man for which Atari has properly obtained a license." That was on page 1 of their motion.

It just didn't happen. If there was a hazard then, and I don't believe there was, the facts since then, the introduction of their cartridge has totally belied that contention in their motion.

2 3

4

5 6

> 7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

25

24

the same of the last own party and it is not been all the same of the last own to the last own Now in Mr. Vittum's closing argument before NAME AND ADDRESS OF THE OWNER, WHEN PER PER your Honor in Nevember, he made this argument, this the party of the last statement from page 310 of our record, "Mr. Moone made period of the last of the last of the last clear his personal involvement had been required because The Real Property lies, the Party lies, the Pa of the large customers, such as, Sears and K-Mort, who had booked orders with Atari based on the assumption that Atari had the exclusive Pac-Man home video game. Mr. Moone's testimony makes clear that while no orders have yet been cancelled, it's an absolute certainty that those orders will be cancelled, and that future orders will be refused if that premise of exclusivity does not hold up. If the K. C. Munchkin game is not enjoined, the damage is direct and certain."

The very opposite has occurred, J. C. Penney which was one of the three companies that Mr. Moone testified has carried their largest retail advertising program of the year for Pac-Man. Sears is selling Pac-Man. Sears Exhibit 38 shows their advertising. K-Mart is selling it as Ms. Hunton testified to. There just is no basis.

Now after this game is introduced, forming any proof or evidence or indication of the arguments that somehow the pre-production investment of Atari would be Giminished, as a result of the sales by K. C. Munchkin, Your Honor is absolutely correct then and I submit it's far more you are correct and will be correct in permitting the continued sale of the K. C. Munchkin game.

lpr 

THE COURT; Well, let me ask you a guestion. Isn't it true that in the present posture of this case it is as if last November I had issued the preliminary injunction? Isn't that where we are now?

MR. ANDERSON: I am sorry, your Honor, I'm not sure
I understood --

THE COURT: Well, here is what I mean. As a result of the Court of Appeals' ruling, the Court of Appeals determined that contrary to the conclusion that I reached, the plaintiff had shown a likelihood of success on the merits, and that the merits was whether or not the K.C. Munchkin home video game infringed the copyright of Atari to Pac-Man and therefore, the Court of Appeals ruled that a preliminary injunction should have been issued at that time.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, except it was the Midway arcade game that was involved, but I think yes, your Honor, you are correct. The Pac-Man home game of Atari wasn't available or known at that time.

THE COURT: But that was -- what was shown here was what they were going to market.

MR. ANDERSON: No, your Honor. I don't think -- to the best of my knowledge, we never saw what Atari was going to market.

MR. VITTUM: We had the Midway large yellow arcade game before the Court in November. The Atari home video version was not in existence and not of record at the time of the

2pr 1

carlier hearing.

3 th

However, the injunction which Atari sought was the injunction to protect their introduction of that as the authorized Pac-Man home video game.

5

6

4

THE COURT: Which was the same. It was the same game, wasn't it?

7

8

9

MR. VITTUM: It is Pac-Man, that's right, your Honor, same characters that the Court of Appeals found present in the North American Phillips game.

10

THE COURT: What was anticipated to be marketed --

11

MR. VITTUM: Was Pac-Man.

12

THE COURT: -- was Pac-Man.

13

MR. VITTUM: That's right, your Honor.

14

THE COURT: That's what I saw here in the courtroom.

15

MR. VITTUM: That's right. That was the Midway game

which the Court saw.

16

MR. ANDERSON: A game called Pac-Man, your Honor.

18

17

THE COURT: I'm tempted to disclose to you gentlemen something which I did not and I think candor and honesty requires me to do so.

20

21

19

You remember that you left that equipment here over the Thanksgiving Holiday. Do you remember that?

23

22

MR. VITTUM: Yes, Sir.

24

25

THE COURT: Well, I happen to have some friends in Centralia, Illinois, one of whom is the clerk of one of the

-3pr1

Illinois Appellate Court Judges, and she has two very precocious youngsters, and they came into this courtroom and there was Pac-Man and K.C. Munchkin, and they promptly disclosed that they knew both games very well and that they were going to play both, and they did, and they turned around and said to everybody present, "These two games are identical."

## (Laughter:)

MR. VITTUM: We will stipulate to that, your Honor.

THE COURT: But I might tell you that I had the memorandum, and since this was entirely extra judicial, I finished the memorandum, but the words of those two precocious youngsters kept ringing in my ears as I wrote the memorandum.

Now -- but as I recall, the Pac-Man game that was introduced in evidence here was the game that Atari was going to market.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, I might point out that in Defendants' Exhibit 34 --

MR. VITTUM: May I explain, your Honor.

MR. ANDERSON: -- the Atari catalog, Atari states concerning their new Pac-Man available in March "adapted from one of the most popular video arcade games ever created, Atari's Pac-Man, which differs slightly from the original, is sure to be a big hit in your home."

MR. VITTUM: That's right.

Y

MR. ANDERSON: I would submit there is nothing in our record at all about what the Atari home video cartridge or game is.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor --

MR. ANDERSON: We just have never had the cartridge,
we have never seen it displayed on a screen. That's an
unknown. But it is now on the market and that's a fundamental
new changed circumstance. It wasn't on the market. It
wasn't even available. We couldn't show it to you.
Apparently at least nobody did show it to your Honor back in
November.

same?

THE COURT: Now do I know now that it is the

MR. ANDERSON: Your Henor, I den't believe you do know that.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, first of all the Atari cartridge is the licensed authorized home video version of the large Pac-Man game which the Court did have in evidence.

The question of the nature of the Atari cartridge and what it consists of is not relevant to the question of whether K. C. Munchkin should be sold in its condition as a violation of the copyright of the Pac-Man arcade game, which is the copyright that was before the Court.

The Court of Appeals found that K. C.

Munchkin infringes the copyright in the Midway arcade

version of Pac-Man, and whether or not the Atari product

was on the market at that time or not is not a relevant

factor with respect to the liability that has been found.

Now, it is highly irrelevant to the question of the harm to Atari of having this adjudicated infringement of the copyright on the market at the very same time it attempting to roll out with national introduction of the licensed Pac-Man video game.

THE COURT: The home video game.

MR. VITTUM: Home video game, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Home video game.

MR. VITTUM: That's right.

MR. ANDERZON: I can't see how counsel can even contend that what Atari's Pac-Man looks like or plays like is irrelevant on the issue before us today, because the issue before us today is not a likelihood of success on the issue of infringement, I agree with Mr. Vittum, that was in issue cumparing the arcade game that your Honor saw and that the Court of Appeals deliberated on.

We are not disputing that part of the Court of Appeals' decision no matter how we disagree with it. The issue today is the irreparable harm or harm at all of any kind that Atari will suffer, if any, and that's the issue, from the continued sale of K. C. Munchkin while we seek review by the Supreme Court of the United States.

We believe fairness and justice should compel that we be permitted to continue.

THE COURT: Continue to sell?

MR. ANDERSON: Continue to sell the K. C. Munchkin while we seek review by the Supreme Court.

As I pointed out, I think circuit rule

17 contemplates that. It is not uncommon. It is not

irregular to permit a defendant to proceed to seek review

before the Sucreme Court and stay an injunction while 2 weare doing that. 3 Now ~- I think maybe we should hear from 4 the plaintiff, but I submit that there is no basis on 5 which they can show injury. Mr. Paul's testimony, the 6 testimony of all of the witnesses here, shows that Atari 7 has the --8 THE COURT: And to focus attention on the 9 lague, the injury would be to Atari from the continued 10 sale of the K. C. Munchkin video game. 11 MR. ANDERSON: That's the sole issue, how it 12 will irreparably injure Atari, if at all, or why Atari 13 couldn't later be completely satisfied in money dameres 14 if it is successful while we seek this review before the 15 Supreme Court. The facts are so clear. Atari has 16 introduced it, their game now in March throughout the 17 United States nationally and apparently they have had 18 19 no difficulties. A few hearsay comments about someone who 20 might question Munchkin doesn't carry today, I subsit, 21 when we have put in such substantial evidence that there to a new controlling circumstance here that wasn't true 23 24 in November. In November Atari was planning to introduce 25

their game in March. They have had testimony about the tromendous injury, that they would suffer loss of their pre-introduction investment and the argument of Mr. Vittum that future orders will be cancelled, and that didn't materialize.

what was their fear in November has proven to be totally unfounded and no basis for fear in March.

THE RESIDENCE OF THE PERSON NAMED IN

The state of the s

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

. . .

lpr<sub>1</sub>

Therefore, there is no evidence of any injury other than their right to recover damage or a royalty or whatever or profits, whatever it may be, and we have put up a million-dollar bond to cover that. So even though we were extremely solvent, and I questioned the necessity of that, we didn't question the bond. We put up the million dollars. There is no problem at all that Atari will be made whole. There is no evidence at all of any injury beyond the injury from the sales that we would make, and what they believe they are entitled to recover based on those sales.

offered to respective owners of the consoles of Atari or of Odyssey. The trademark has been mentioned. Atari and Midway have exploited the trademark. People who want Pac-Man go and buy Pac-Man. They are not going -- today they are not going to buy Munchkin either thinking they are getting Pac-Man or because Pac-Man is not available, because now it is available. It is on the market. And if anyone buys Odyssey's K.C. Munchkin, your Honor, I submit that it's because K.C. Munchkin is a different game. It has features that are totally different from Pac-Man. It has the moving dots and the features that make it attractive and that's the only reason that anyone is going to buy Munchkin today. If they want Pac-Man they will buy Pac-Man. It's available.

If they want Munchkin they will buy Munchkin. There is no injury at all that can't be compensated.

THE COURT: What about this point that Mr. Vittum makes that the Court of Appeals in its opinion came to the conclusion that as a matter of law the sale of the K.C. Munchkin home video game infringes the copyright of the Pac-Man video game?

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, the Court of Appeals has indicated that they see a likelihood of success on the merits, but they specifically indicate they are not prejudging the case on the merits, that we are clearly entitled to a trial and certainly on a trial on the various issues on which we stipulated solely for the purpose of this motion, and we believe that we will ultimately prevail on the merits of the copyright case.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. ANDERSON: Once we get to it.

The Court: You will prevail by demonstrating they are different games?

MR. ANDERSON: I think we will prevail on several different grounds, your Honor. We will develop the evidence on that further and I believe we can convince your Honor as well as the Court of Appeals that they are different games, but that's just one. We believe there

are other issues.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ANDERSON: That will arise that bear very fundamentally on whether or not they have a copyright here that can be enforced, and if so, what it covers and what it does not cover.

In addition to that, the Court of Appeals, of course, at Page 27 and the top of Page 28 did discuss this question of irreparable injury. They first indicated that it is normally a presumption and then they cited only a few basic statistics that really don't show irreparable injury at all.

The point that Atari has booked orders for Pac-Man in excess of one million cartridges with a sales value of over \$24,000,000, that was the circumstance in November. That circumstance has completely changed. That million cartridges that caused the Court of Appeals to make this observation have now been delivered. The \$24,000,000 presumably -- or they are about to be delivered this week, if not -- that wasn't exactly clear, but they are being shipped right now or have been shipped, and they have a sales value of over \$24,000,000. That means this one to five million dollars of preintroduction investment that Atari made has been recouped certainly, and more, so that the circumstances in November that caused the Court of Appeals to believe,

and the facts that they recite at Page 27 has caused them to believe that there would be an irreparable injury now have failed to materialize.

The very facts that they rely upon have evaporated and the only question is should K.C. Munchkin be permitted to stay on the market for a period of time while we seek review of what the Court of Appeals has done before the U.S. Supreme Court.

We had filed a motion for leave to stay the mandate while we go to the Supreme Court. We indicated in that motion --

THE COURT: You didn't tell me that you filed a motion to stay the mandate.

MR. ANDERSON: We have filed a motion to stay the mandate.

THE COURT: In the Court of Appeals?

MR. ANDERSON: In the Court of Appeals.

THE COURT: Has that motion been acted on?

MR. ANDERSON: Only by an order that says that will be taken under advisement, our motion to stay the mandate while we have the opportunity to go before the Supreme Court and, your Honor, I think, according to the circuit rule, the only showing that we are required to make is that our petition to the Supreme Court is made in good faith, it is not for purposes of delay, and I submit while

it is not an issue before you today, you can very clearly -- and I represent to the Court personally now that it is in very good faith that we pursue this.

the same of the sa

and the second s

THE COUNT: Let me ask you another question. How long would this stay take effect if it remains?

MR. ANDERSON: As I understand it, the way the rule structures such a proceeding, we will have 30 days in which to file our patition for writ of certiorari. If we file within the 30 days, then the stay of the mandate and the stay of the injunction, if your Honor sees it the way we do, the stay of the mandate will continue until the Supreme Court either rejects or accepts the petition for a writ, and that could be another -- it is hard to say, another menth or two or whatever it takes the Supreme Court to review it.

THE COURT: Let me see if I follow this. If the Supreme Court -- let's assume the worst, you always must -- if the Supreme Court denies the petition for certiorari, the stay will be automatically vacated.

MR. ANDERSON: I think that's the way the stay of the mandate would be entered, your Honor. At least in my past experience that's the way the stay of the mandate is entered. It is entered for 30 days, and if the defendant files its writ, petition for writ within the 30 days, then the stay continues until the petition for the writ is decided and ther, as I understand it, if it is writ is decided and ther, as I understand it, if it is decided, of course, then we get forward. If it is decided, then that is the final adjudication of the appeal, final

determination of appeal, and it would then come back down.

THE DOUGT: As far as a proliminary injunction is concerned.

MR. ANDERSON: I think at that point the proliminary injunction would go into effect upon that event if it occurs, yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I just want to understand how this stay would operate.

Then we go back to what I said a moment ago, that we would be in the same position as we would have been if the preliminary injunction had been issued, in which case it would stay in effect until the case is heard on the merits.

MR. ANDERSON: The preliminary injunction at that point would go into effect, and it would say in effect until we hear the case on the merits, if we are successful, yes, your Honor.

Mr. Williams points out that, of course, at that time if circumstances have changed, further motions by either side might be brought and we might seek to have the preliminary injunction altered or lifted at that time, but lacking that, I think your Honor's assumptions on the sequence are correct.

I think, your Honor, in conclusion we are

asking for this, a continuation of the stay. We are 1 opposing the motion that the plaintiffs have brought in 2 the belief that there is absolutely no indication, no 3 evidence of any injury other than that can clearly be 4 compensated for in monetary damages. There is nothing that 5 is irreparable. There is nothing that this plaintiff can 6 7 show that is justification for the imposition at this 8 time while we seek petition of an injunction that will 9 injure, obviously injure K. C. Munchkin, Odyssey, and North American Philips far more than can be justified or is required. 12

THE COURT: Before you sit down, let me ask you just to be sure I understand this, then I am going to hear Mr. Vittum, but am I not correct that the copyright to the Pac-Man game that was before the Court in November is the same copyright that covers the home video game that's now being marketed?

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, we don't know that. but I think they have so indicated.

MR. VITTUM: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: They have alleged that.

MR. VITTUM: Yes, your Honor.

MR. ANDERSON: They have alleged that but we haven't seen it. Nobody has seen the game in this courtram. There is no evidence about what the home game was other

10 11

14 15

13

17

16

18 19

20 21

22

23

than some very general testimony.

So we don't know that, but that will be one of the ~~

THE COURT: By the way, has the complaint been answered, the complaint filed in this Court?

MR. ANDERSON: The complaint was answered and an amended complaint was filed, and I think that answer was filed today, was it, or is being filed today.

MR. WILLIAMS: It will be filed today.

MR. ANDERSON: An answer to the amended complaint is being filed today. The amended complaint really differs from the criminal complaint that we did answer by alleging a trademark or a Lanham Act violation in addition to the other allegations of the original complaint.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. VITTUM: Just a few brief comments, your Honor.

First of all, I would submit that the case is not entirely in the same posture as though this Court had granted the preliminary injunction following the hearing in N vember. The difference is that an Appellate Court has entered its determination, and since one of the four factors that this Court should assess in determining whether to attinue the stay is the likelihood of success on further review, we have one more Court's determination. That

wouldn't have been the case originally.

Secondly, I am absolutely amazed at Mr. Anderson's argument that there is no harm to Atari because Atari is now on the market. He was arguing the exact apposite at the hearing last fall, that a preliminary injunction was not appropriate because Atari was not yet on the market. Suraly he can't have it both ways.

THE COURT: What is the harm? You mentioned one and that is this apparent tendency of people to say that this is a Pac-Man type came or words to that effect. That's one of them.

MR. VITTUM: That's one. That's one. The second one is the --

THE COURT: You say that as a matter of -- well, the Court of Appeals, of course, did not decide the merits of this case.

MR. VITTUM: That's correct. That's correct.

THE COURT: And rulings ordinarily on motions
for preliminary injunction do not determine the ultimate
issues in the case. So that -- how would you articulate
this? How would you say it?

MR. VITTUM: The second point I would make,
your Honor, is that because of the incompatability of the
cortridges, the Court of Appeals recognized the harm to
Atari is accentuated due to the incompatability.

. .

lpr,

Secondly, the Court of Appeals pointed out that the short lives of video games make it imperative that the injunctive relief be granted when it is effective. If this injunction does not become effective until after the case goes through certiorari to the United States Supreme Court, there is a summer recess, it very well may be that

In view of the well known -- there is testimony in the record to this, your Honor -- short lives of video games, that is an additional reason why Atari is harmed during the interim period by the continued sales.

THE COURT: What about the other possibility that the United States Supreme Court will take the case and then find unanimously as it did in two separate cases recently, that the Court of Appeals is not correct and that the District Court was? Supposing that were to happen, then how would the --

MR. VITTUM: Then the case would come back down.

THE COURT: What about the harm in the meantime to -- as I understand the injunction, what the plaintiff or the plaintiffs are arguing for here is to actually shut down North American Phillips as a marketer and seller.

MR. VITTUM: Yes, but --

THE COURT: Of the K.C. Munchkin game.

MR. VITTUM: During the period the injunction is in

-2pr1

01 525

force, and I would submit that it's a remote chance, but
the Court may very well be right, it may very well be
the case where the Supreme Court reverses. If that's the
case, they can go back on the market with K.C. Munchkin
at that time. A preliminary injunction does not require
them to do anything more than cease the manufacture, promotion and sale. They can put the K.C. Munchkin in inventory,
retain it and go back on the market without any inconvenience
at all.

In fact, there is no evidence in today's record, your Honor, of harm to North American Phillips and that's one of the factors which North American Phillips has the burden. In fact, from Mr. Anderson's argument, one sees the question raised why hasn't Atari established how it would be harmed.

The Court of Appeals made very clear, your Honor, that the burden is on North American --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. VITTUM: And I would submit that they have not shown any evidence, controlling evidence that overcomes the factors that were before the Court of Appeals and the interrelationship between the hardware, the cartridges, the short lives of the video games, those are matters which as a matter of law the Court of Appeals determined were irreparable injury to the plaintiffs.

lpr,

THE COURT: Well, one harm that you point out is that this tendency of people to say that this is a Pac-Man-type game.

MR. VITTUM: That's. right.

THE COURT: But how does that harm the plaintiff? That's what I am trying to understand.

MR. VITTUM: It harms the plaintiff in two different ways, your Honor. The plaintiff Midway, which is the copyright proprietor of the arcade game, is involved in an extensive licensing program for dolls, T-shirts, novelties and many other authorized Pac-Man products.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. VITTUM: If the game is indiscriminately used with respect to unauthorized, unlicensed products, that severely damages Midway's licensing program.

As to Atari, it forces Atari to recouch its advertising so that the advertising message is not, "Come and get Pac-Man from Atari." You have to convince the consumer that it is only Atari that they can get Pac-Man from. It dilutes the effect that would otherwise be given to Atari's initial start of advertising.

all of those factors are harmed by the casual or indiscriminate or unauthorized association of the Pac-Man game with an infringing product, such as, K.C. Munchkin.

Your Honor, just in closing, I would point out

apr 1

that at Page 28 of the Court of Appeals opinion --

THE COURT: Before you leave that.

MR. VITTUM: Sure.

THE COURT: Is Mr. Anderson correct in his -- as
I understand the thrust of what he is saying, and I am
adding some words to what he is saying, but it is that
contrary to the allegations of the complaint and the
evidence heard last November and the contentions made,
Pac-Man is such a great video game attraction that instead
of sales being adversely affected, and as a matter of fact,
nobody can find a Pac-Man cartridge to buy today. He is
saying that.

MR. VITTUM: Well, your Honor --

THE COURT: As I understand what he is saying.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, if they can't find a Pac-Man cartridge today, they can get it next month, and if not next month, next summer and if not next summer, sometime after that but sooner or later, we will make one and they ought to buy it from one, and that's what the copyright law says. We have the authorized right that is protected subject matter.

THE COURT: A monopoly.

MR. VITTUM: Authorized monopoly under the statute and Constitution of the United States.

THE COURT: And you say, to the extent that somebody may even think of buying a K. C. Munchkin, that's damage?

MR. VITTUM: If they buy one, your Honor, it is and we have had testimony of sales, somewhat in excess of 360,000 units projected for this year.

The Court of Appeals, your Honor, and again I just want to, in closing, briefly point out that the Court of Appeals pointed out that a preliminary injunction is necessary to preserve the integrity of the copyright laws which seek to encourage individual effort and creativity by granting valuable, enforceable rights.

If the injunction is stayed, your Honor, in this context, we submit that there aren't enforcesble rights. That North American Philips is continuing to be permitted to profit by the marketing of a product that's been found to be infringed by the Court of Appeals. The likelihood of the Supreme Court review is somethin, that this court can accept, can consider and can exercise its discretion about, and we would submit, your Honor, balancing all of these factors and in light of the burden that the Court of Appeals has established, that the defendants are not entitled to any further stay and the injunction should go into effect immediately.

As I indicated earlier, also that some form

American dealers advising them of that fact. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: You want to close, Mr. Anderson?

MR. ANDERSON: I would just say the issue here
is not the preliminary injunction, as you pointed out, but
it's the'stay of the injunction pending appeal until this
ipical, interlocutory appeal, is resolved. That's the only
issue today, not --

THE COURT: I know.

MR. ANDERSON: -- the ultimate question of preliminary injunction, until we get to the merits of the case.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I am going to invite each side to submit a proposed order. Did you say, Mr. Anderson, that you think the plaintiffs ought to be heard from?

What is it the plaintiffs will introduce?

MR. ANDERSON: I think if they have anything to support Mr. Vittum's argument, they ought to put it in.

I om not trying to tell plaintiffs how to manage their case.

MR. VITTUM: I think it's appropriate to make the moulum at the close of the provent's case.

THE COURT: All right. Will you each propose

an order.

MR. VITTUM: I have an order, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let me see it, Mr. Grice.

MR. ANDERSON: Well, we do not have an order

prepared.

THE COURT: I will give you an opportunity.

As I said, I have all the rest of today and you have to

make a status report to the Court of Appeals.

MR. VITTUM: At 5:00 o'clock, your Honor.

THE COURT: At 5:00 o'clock.

lpr1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ANDERSON: Shall we return -- submit the order and return it?

THE COURT: I suggest to you we reconvene at 3:00 o'clock.

MR. ANDERSON: Fine. Thank you.

THE COURT: Give me the proposed order you have, and in the meantime, remember that the plaintiffs did submit an outline of authorities which I have, and I don't have any from the defendants.

MR. ANDERSON: We -- I am sorry. We don't have an outline of authority from the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: No, what is it?

MR. ANDERSON: I am sorry.

THE COURT: What is stated in their outline is just simply the cases with which I am generally familiar, but if you want to call my attention to any case to the contrary, you may.

MR. ANDERSON: All right. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We will reconvene at 3:00 o'clock.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, we do have two witnesses that would be relatively brief if the Court would like to have the benefit of evidence before it rules, and we will be more than happy to present that very briefly.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't you do that.

MR. VITTUM: All right. Mr. Springer will examine the

3/1/2.

3 4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

17 18

19

21

22

23 24

25

20

first witness, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SPRINGER: Your Honor, plaintiff calls Richard Keegan, and the state of t

# RICHARD KEEGAN,

called as a witness on behalf of the plaintiffs, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Be seated, please. State your full name for the record, spell your last name, lean forward and speak directly into that microphone and keep your voice up.

THE WITNESS: My name is Richard Keegan. I live in Greenwich, Connecticut.

### DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. SPRINGER

- O Mr. Keegan, who do you work for?
- A Doyle, Dane & Burnback Advertising, Inc.
- Q What relationship does the Doyle, Dane Advertising Agency have to Atari?
- A We are the advertising agency for the computer games.
- Q What kinds of advertising has Atari been engaged in so far with respect to the introduction of the Pac-Man home video game?
  - A We started first having seen K.C. Munchkin was

BPET

on the market. We are now introducing Pac-Man itself.

We have had to change our advertising thrust a little bit because, in our opinion, there is confusion as to whether we have the real Pac-Man, and that Pac-Man does play only on Atari video sets.

Q . What effect has the presence of K.C. Munchkin had on the marketplace on Atari's advertising program to date?

A We have had, as I say, to change it. We also had to spend additional dollars.

And can you qualify for us the amount of additional dollars that Atari has had to spend on advertising by reason of the presence of K.C. Munchkin.

A I say, additional dollars, that would be about two and a half million dollars over what we decided to do in the beginning.

- Q \$2,500,000 more than you first planned?
  - A That's correct.
- Q That's just by reason of the fact K.C. Munchkin is on the market?
  - A That's correct.

c t

Now we have heard some testimony about Atari's roll-out, the so-called roll-out plan, and what is going to happen is that Atari is introducing Pac-Man for home video this month, is that correct?

A That is correct.

Q Could you outline for the Court what the Atari roll-out plan, which is now starting today, entails.

All right. It starts today, as you know, at a press conference which announces that we are doing this which is important not only to consumers but to the trade. It's to clarify confusion that we are Pac-Man and are coming, and due on April 3rd, it will be the national Pac-Man day which will be covered in 25 cities which will be a promotion, and Pac-Man will visit those cities and there will be contests for kids and so forth.

In addition, we are going to print and have television advertising.

- Q How much will Atari spend in the next three or four weeks on the roll-out of the Pac-Man?
  - A Probably \$2.5 to \$3 million.
- Q Could you tell us and tell the Court what effect the presence, the continued presence, of K. C. Munchkin on the market would have on Atari's roll-out plan?
- A Well, from a creative standpoint, it makes us change our thrust. Instead of selling the game for what it

in, the fun, the enjoyment, we have to make the position elear that we have the only Fac-Man and it does only play on our hardware.

Why do you have to make that position clear?
Why do you have to make it clear that Atari has the only
Pac-Man available on the market?

A , So the consumer who, I think we believe and I have evidence at least to believe in our minds will be confused, they will not know whether or not if they bought our Pac-Man. They understand that when they buy our Pac-Man, it works on Atari consoles. If they bought a K. C. Munchkin, it does not work on our equipment.

Do you have any view on what effect, if any, the presence of K. C. Munchkin has on the effectiveness of the Atari Pac-Man roll-out plan?

MR. ANDERSON: I object, your Honor. There is no foundation for that. It's pure speculation based upon information that, apparently, this witness doesn't have.

THE COURT: Let me hear the question.

(Record read.)

THE COURT: I assume it's from the point of view of an advertising arent executive. I assume that.

MR. SPRINGER: That's right, your Honor.

THE COURT: Based on his experience and

knowledge, with that understanding, the objection will be

verruled.

Let the witness answer.

THE RESERVE AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY NAMED IN COLUMN TWO PARTY NAM

BY THE WITNESS:

A I think it diminishes the effect of Atari's advertising. One, because it diminishes our share of advertising. That's how much advertising we have coming if K. C., Munchkin is in there and two, I think it causes great confusion in the consumer's mind as to which is the Pac-Man and what is being sold to them, and what to look for, more importantly, when they go into the store.

THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY.

NAME AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY.

Control of the last test and the second control of the second cont

PE1

---

In your view, the presence of K.C. Munchkin on the market today has the effect of confusing consumers?

MR. ANDERSON: I object, your Honor. Leading the witness.

THE COURT: The objection will be sustained. BY MR. SPRINGER:

Q Do you have a view on what the effect on consumers is of the presence of K.C. Munchkin on the market?

A Yes, I think that they are going to be confused.

I think there is a chance, also, they could be, in some outlets, switched.

Now when you say you think in some instances they could be switched, could you elaborate for us.

A Yes, you go in to buy -- I will talk in general terms. You go in to buy a product and the product is not available. The dealer would like to sell you something else, make a switch and say that this is the same thing or just as good.

Q If there were dealers out there who are saying, "Why wait for Pac-Man. You can have K.C. Munchkin now," that customer would be steered?

MR. ANDERSON: I object, your Honor. No foundation for that hypothetical.

MR. SPRINGER. There is evidence in the record, your Honor.

pr 1

3

4

5

6

7

2

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

THE COURT: The objection is overruled. He may answer. answer.

# ----

A Yes.

the second of the second secon THE COURT: All right.

### BY MR. SPRINGER:

THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY NAMED IN Mr. Staup testified that he didn't know at all about whether it would be difficult or not to cancel co-op advertising.

THE RESERVE OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN 2 IS NOT THE OWNER. Do you recall that testimony? THE RESERVE THE PERSON NAMED IN

Yes.

Could you advise us and the Court whether it The result of the Party of the would be difficult for, in your experience in the advertising THE RESERVED AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY. business; whether it would be difficult to cancel co-op the could do not be the first date out . I had the table advertising?

A It has been my experience on accounts I have THE R. P. LEWIS CO., LANSING MICH. LANSING MICH. LANSING MICH. worked on that a simple letter or a Mail-A-Gram or telegram AT COMPLETE OR STREET, to the trade saying that there will be no more co-op As of the Parket was been sen to be a parket of the latter. advertising that they will be responsible for is sufficient And department from many passes for many laboration and to stop it.

Certainly, the circumstances have to be explained Charles on the Control of the Contro but a court order would certainly be clear that it would have to be stopped.

What effect would a court order have on the ability of North American to pull out of its advertising commitments, if any?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

A I am not aware. I guess it gives them no choice but to go ahead and do that. It adds power to the fact it has to be done.

MR. SPRINGER: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Cross examination.

# CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Q Mr. Keegan, you indicated that Atari is spending \$2,500,000 on the roll-out plan?

A Yes, sir.

Q Is that the entire budget of Atari for Pac-Man for this period of time?

A To this date, we may put more money, but to this date, yes.

Q That's all of it, \$2,500,000 is the total budget of Atari for advertising?

For this rollout to this date.

Q And starting from what time to what time does that cover?

A Starting our advertising which started last week, two weeks ago.

Q And that's, essentially, all the advertising that has been done on Pac-Man?

A No, there was additional advertising done before

4pr which was teaser advertising done in December and January.

and the same of th

Q How much was that? Do you know?

The state of the s

The state of the s

the latest term to the second second

A My quess is it was about \$1,000,000.

- 2
- .3
- 4 5
- 6
- 8

- 9
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 16
- 17
- 19

18

20

- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

- And you testified that because of K. G. Munchkin, Atari has increased their expenditure on Pac-Man advertising, is that correct?
  - That's correct.
- And you said that they increased it by \$2.5 million?
  - A That's correct.
- Q Does that mean you wouldn't have had a roll-out lf it wouldn't have been for the Munchkin?
- A We would have had a roll-out, but it would have been at a lower rate.
  - Q You said you are only spending \$2.5 million?
- I said we are spending \$2.5 million at this mament. We will continue to spend more money as we go on. We have not budgeted that money yet.
- What is the total advertising budget of Atari
  for Pac-Man from the beginning of Pac-Man?
- A If you put it together at this moment, it's probably close to over \$4 million.
- an increase of \$2.5 million in Atari advertising because of K. C. Munchkin? Is that documented?
- MR. VITTUM: Objection, your Honor. He has asked two different questions.
  - MR. ANDERSON: I will ask the first one first.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. ANDERSON:

What is the basis -- I will strike the whole question.

What is your documentary basis for saying that there was an increase of \$2.5 million in Pac-Man advertising to cope with K. C. Munchkin?

I am not certain I have documentary evidence other than we sat down and said that here is what we have to do and decided to put more dollars and so did the client.

There is nothing more than that available in the way of correboration for your testimony, is that correct?

A Not to my knowledge.

MR. ANDERSON: No further questions, your Hanner.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

### BY MR. SPRINGER:

Q Mr. Keegan, you mentioned that about \$1 million was spent in December and January on teaser advertising?

A Yes.

- Q Why was it necessary to spend that \$1 million on teaser advertising?
- In a make certain that the consumer and the trade knew that we had Pac-Man, Atari had Pac-Man, and that was coming. To blunt what we thought was going to be, and

2

1

4

3

6

7

5

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

21

20

22

23

2

4

3

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

25

believe, was confusion.

Where did that confusion come from?

A People looking at commercials for Munchkin and thinking it was Pac-Man.

> MR. SPRINGER: No further questions, your Honor. RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Keegan, do you have any of that teaser advertising with you?

A No, I don't. With me, no. It was newspapers. MR. ANDERSON: No further questions, your Honor. Thank you.

MR. VITTUM: Nothing further for this witness. THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Keegan. THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, at this time I would like to take the opportunity to offer into evidence Tlaintiffs' Exhibits 21 and 22 for identification which were marked during the cross examination of witnesses this morning.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Anderson? MR. ANDERSON: No, sir.

2

4

5

6

8

7

10

9

11

13

14

16

18

17

19

21

23

25

THE COURT: They are admitted into evidence.

(Whereupon said Defendants' Exhibits 21

and 22 were admitted into evidence.)

THE COURT: All right. Your next witness.

MR. VITTUM: The plaintiffs will call Mr. Paul.

THE COURT: Mr. Paul come forward and resume

the Witness chair. Mr. Faul has been sworn.

CHARLES S. PAUL,

colled as a witness by the plaintiffs herein, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:

# DIRECT EXAMINATION

# BY MR. VITTUM:

Q Mr. Paul, I remind you are still under oath.

Mr. Paul, has the presence of K. C.

Munchkin on the market available for sale affected Atari's introduction of the Atari Pac-Man cartridge?

- A Yes, it has.
- Could you describe how that effect has occurred.
- As was previously testified, we had to restructure our advertising focus in order to correct what we saw as confusion with not only tesser ads, which told the consumer that we were coming out with Pac-Man, but also to restructure our advertising to explain to the consumer that it was only from Atari that Pac-Man was available.

On the market have an effect on Atari's sales of Pac-Man cartridges?

A Absolutely.

Gould you describe how that effect is manifested.

As was stated earlier, a video game has a finite life and as I testified earlier, also, the sales at the beginning of the cycle, the product introduction with all of this advertising surrounding it, the sales have been going well.

The danger to us is in the middle of the run of a game's life where we are building inventory and the demand for that inventory softens because of those sales having already been made for K. C. Munchkin. When someone buys a K. C. Munchkin, there is no need for them to buy a Pac-Man.

Mr. Paul, I show you a document that I have marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 24 for identification which is a copy of a page from the March 10, 1982 Chicago Sun-Times. That's Wednesday of last week, and it has a headline reading: "Munchkin Gets Green Light In video Games by these."

Mr. Paul, with respect to publicity -THE COURT: Is that the one in which they

MR. VITTUM: I believe it is, your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to deny it. If it gots buck up to the Court of Appeals, I want to deny that.

All right. Let's proceed.

MR. VITTUM: All right.

BY MR. VITTUM:

Mr. Paul, how does the existence of publicity, such as that reflected in the headline which I read in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 24, how does that affect /tari's roll-out of its Pac-Man video game?

That type of publicity and the awareness in the trade, in other words, major retailers, and the distribution of this case through publicity like this or through news traveling through the trade press has clearly led to the impression that we cannot stop K. C. Munchkin from selling at retail, and that Atari has sumehow a maremised in its ability to enforce its copyright of Pac-Man.

The stay has that effect.

Pr 

Q If Atari had to wait until after the Supreme Court denied certiorari, before having the benefits of injunctive relief against K.C. Munchkin, what affect would that have on Atari's Pac-Man cartridge business?

A The orders for video game cartridges come in waves, as I described. There is an initial wave from retail orders and then the orders are renewed and extended.

This first 45 to 60-day period is critical to us in our production.

The petition for cert -- pending a petition for cert would overlap with this product introduction, and in my view, severely damage the length that this game would run on the shelves for us.

MR. VITTUM: No further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Cross examination.

### CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Q Mr. Paul, has Atari ever spent \$2,500,000 on the introduction of a video game, home video game cartridge, before in promoting it?

A Atari has never spent \$2,500,000 on a product introduction of this type, and we never had to.

Q What was the largest sum you have invested in a product introduction prior to Pac-Man?

A I would say in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000.

testimony that there was an advertising restructuring that came about at Atari as a result of Munchkin?

A As was testified to by our advertising executive

O Do you have any documents to show to support your

A As was testified to by our advertising executive earlier, that restructuring or refocusing of the strategy on the ads was the result of a number of meetings between the ad agency, the marketing people and top management of Atari.

Do you have any specific example of two ads or a proposed ad that was changed in some way, specifically, that we could look at to see exactly what you are talking about?

A Sir, I have the various ads that we have run and to date, from the beginning of the tease campaign, I could revise it and see whether any two of those ads would provide you with that contrast.

The restructuring is just now hitting the markets with our new campaign. A lot of that is in print, radio and television.

Q . So you would have to look to compare ads? You don't know of your own testimony now?

A My own, no, I don't. I am sorry, sir.

Q With respect to this article, Plaintiffs' Exhibit
24, did Atari issue any press releases at all with respect
to any of the events, with respect to Pac-Man and Munchkin
in the last five months?
A I am not sure I understand your question.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, I will object.
BY MR. ANDERSON:

November with respect to the Munchkin/Pac-Man dispute?

THE COURT: Would you hold it just a moment.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, I will object to

this question on the grounds of being beyond the scope of direct. There is no basis for suggesting that Plaintliffs' Exhibit 24 arrived or came from any kind of Atari press release. In fact, quite the centrary, your Honor. It was not the basis of any press release by Atari so I object to the question on that basis.

THE COURT: What about that?

MR. ANDERSON: The question, as I rephrased it, doesn't refer to this particular newspaper ad at all, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then the objection is overruled.

Proceed.

#### BY THE WITNESS:

A I believe there was a press release from Werner Communications in response to the decision by the Court of Appeals, and I am certain that there was no press release from Atari or Warner Communications in response to the stay of this Court of that injunction.

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Q Do you have a copy of that press release from warner Communications:

A No, I don't.

With respect to the various articles that appeared about Pac-Man in the press resulting in part, at least, from this litigation, haven't those articles actually been helpful to Pac-Man in getting Pac-Man's name before the public?

My epinion, which you are asking for, is that the articles that have appeared about this litigation have only heightened the trade's awareness of the fact that there may be some difficulty that Atari is having in enforcing its copyright and bringing to the consumer and to the trade original, copyrighted games only, again, from Atari.

The publicity on this litigation has made it difficult for us to explain to retailers that we have copyrights that have been licensed to us, and we can enforce them against infringement.

- Q You have had to explain that, you say?
- A Yes, indeed.
- But in fact, you have no documentation that
  any refer has ever been cancelled as a result of this, is
  that correct?
  - .. Sir, as I mentioned, the vulnerability of a

product sales will come at the middle or the second half of that product's life cycle. At the beginning after the product's introduction, with this massive advertising attended to that introduction, the sales will go quickly in the beginning. However, the vulnerability is very real in the middle of the life cycle of the product.

- Has Ateri arrived at a projection of the life cycle of this Pac-Man game that's being promoted in so many ways, you said dolls, coloring books, I guess, and I am not sure exactly what else you mentioned.
- I have advised top management of Atari that the life cycle of this product, in some direct extent, to some direct extent, is dependent on the injunction being issued by this Court.
- Q What life cycle have you projected for -- if you have made a specific projection.
  - A . No, we have not. I am sorry.
  - Q You have not?
  - A. No, sir.

MR. ANDERSON: No further questions, your Honor.

MR. VITTUM: Just one brief question, your

Honor.

Paul - redirect

#### REDIRECT EXAMINATION

11.36

BY MR. VITTUM:

Q Mr. Paul, we have referred to various kinds of vulnerability that Atari has while K.C. Munchkin remains on the market.

Do you have any information with respect to the affect of the continued presence of K.C. Munchkin in the marketplace on other violations of the Pac-Man copyright?

MR. ANDERSON: I object, your Honor. I think
that is totally speculative, and in November, you
refused to permit testimony about other disputes in
other parts of the country and in other courts. The
objection should be sustained at this time, too.

THE COURT: What do you mean by "other"?

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, perhaps we can get the witness to say whether he has a basis for that.

What I am driving at, your Honor, is the fact that there are other marketers of software and cartridges which are contended to be infringements of the Paç-Man copyright that we very strongly believe have entered the market because of the success of K.C. Munchkin in maintaining on the market notwithstanding litigation.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, I think that there is no basis at all for answering that question.

THE COURT: That objection will be sustained

1 2

lpr

because I can see some problems.

MR. VITTUM: No further questions of this witness.

THE COURT: But I want to ask Mr. Paul a question.

MR. VITTUM: Surely.

THE COURT: Mr. Paul, when was this advertising for Pac-Man restructured, as you said? When was that in point of time? Do you know?

THE WITNESS: In point of time, it was the result -advertising strategy evolves out of a series of sessions
and presentations from advertising agencies to the
maketing and top management of a company. This
restructure or refocusing of our ad campaign, the
message we are trying to convey, has been retargeted
over the last, I would say, two to three months.

When we realized what was going on in the marketplace.

à 1 s17

When thet restructuring decision
was made, to follow up in a question that Mr. Anderson
asked, was there any memorandum prepared that stated,
"Look, as a result of K. C. Munchkin, we have to
restructure this advertising"? Was a memo prepared
or communication that showed the necessity for this
restructuring? That's what I was trying to understand.

THE WITNESS: I see most of the documents that

flow between our ad agency and top management. I

haven't seen such a document, but to me that's not

surprising because with business at this pace,

changing as fast as it does, most of our decisions are

made over tables.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. VITTUM: Your Honor, let me just perhaps

recall to the Court that during Mr. Moone's testimony
last fall he pointed out that Atari was proceeding

with the initial phase of the teaser advertising
as a direct result of K. C. Munchkin's introduction.

No further questions.

THE COURT: Any other questions of Mr. Paul?

MR. VITTUM: No, your Honor.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Reconvene at 3:00 o'clock.

2

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

14

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

is that it?

MR. VITTUM: If I may, I just have two exhibits to get in. Then the plaintiffs will be prepared to rest. THE COURT: All right.

MR. VITTUM: I would offer Plaintiffs' Exhibit 24 for identification, which is the Sun-Times article.

THE COURT: Any objection, Mr. Anderson?

MR. ANDERSON: Not to 24, your Honor, but can you tell me what 23 is, please?

MR. VITTUM: In a minute. I skipped it.

MR. ANDERSON: I see, I'm sorry.

MR. VITTUM: And as Plaintiffs' Exhibit 23 for identification, your Honor, we would offer an affidavit of Mr. Beggs, one of the counsel for defendants, filed in the Court of Appeals in support of their application for stay of mandate. It contains statements of the defendants' position on the merits of the review they would seek on certiorari.

Your Honor, we submit that that is relevant to the issue of likelihood of success which the Court should take into account.

THE COURT: What does that affidavit show, may I see 1t?

It states the points that are involved,

MR. VITTUM: Yes.

4 5

MR. ANDERSON: No objection.

THE COURT: That's admitted in evidence.

(Said exhibits were thereupon received into evidence as Plaintiffs' Exhibits 23 and 24.)

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. VITTUM: The plaintiffs rest, your Honor.

THE COURT: We will adjourn and meet at 3:00

going to look at these documents again.

MR. VITTUM: Thank you.

(Whereupon a recess was taken at 12:30 p.m. until 3:00 p.m. of the same day, Tuesday, March 16, 1982.)

### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

ATARI, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs, )

vs. 81 C 6434

NORTH AMERICAN PHILIPS CONSUMER ) ELECTRONICS CORP., et al., )

Defendants. )

Before the HONORABLE GEORGE N. LEIGHTON

Tuesday, March 16, 1982

3:00 p.m.

The hearing was resumed pursuant to recess.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. DANIEL VITTUM

MR. DAVID SPRINGER

MR. MARTIN LAGOD 

for the Plaintiff Atari, Inc.;

MR. ERIC COHEN

MR. DONALD WELSH

for the Plaintiff Midway Manufacturing Co.;

MR. THEODORE W. ANDERSON

MR. JAMES T. WILLIAMS

MR. GREGORY B. BEGGS

for the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: I have reviewed the two proferred orders, one by the plaintiff vacating the stay of injunction and the other by the defendants continuing the stay of injunction.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

I have also reviewed the affidavit of Gregory

B. Beggs, which was admitted in evidence. This affidavit
happened to have been filed in the Court of Appeals, stating
the bases which the defendants will rely on in their petition for certioni.

AND RESIDENCE AND PERSONS ASSESSMENT OF THE PARTY NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE OWNER, THE PARTY NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NAMED IN COLUMN T The plaintiffs had submitted earlier an outline the first property of the property and was property from the party of of the points and authorities concerning a stay, and as the parties have stated in both drafts of the order, this With the terminate, if his spirits, it will be a supply to the party of hearing was conducted in accordance with the order of the CHARLES THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF THE PA United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit dated March 11, 1982, and the purpose of the hearing is to determine whether the defendants could make the requisite DATES THE PERSON NAMED AND PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO PERSONS NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT NA showing that they will be irreparably injured if this stay ner manager services are been as an a were vacated. I think both parties agree that the burden NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY OF TAXABLE PARTY OF TAXABLE PARTY. is on the defendants to establish the requirement for the continuance of the stay. ANALYSIS OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN

If the stay were to remain, it would be pending the determination in the United States Supreme Court of the petition for writ of certiorari and if that writ were granted, the stay would in that event, the stay would continue until the Supreme Court of the United States

. 0 .

disposes of the proceeding before it.

After reviewing all of these documents, the Court concludes that this stay should be vacated. The plaintiff has filed a bond of a hundred thousand dollars, and as the Court understand it, based on the showing, in the event it were determined that this preliminary injunction should not have been issued, the defendants will be made whole, by a plaintiff which everyone concedes is a totally solvent plaintiff and a proper showing can be made as to the injury that may befall the defendants as a result of the preliminary injunction and its continued force during the proceedings in the Supreme Court of the United States.

For these reasons, I am going to enter the order vacating the stay of injunction and I'll do it between now and the time you have to report to the Court of Appeals.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, if the Court is going to enter an order vacating the stay, I would like to address the particular order, if I may, that has been proposed and more particularly, I would like to address the letter that has been proposed.

I think there is no reason -- no basis for requiring the sending of this letter, and I would like to have that portion of the order vacating the stay eliminated, and I think the letter is not couched in proper terms.

I think the defendants should have the right and the opportunity to write their own letters or determine their

\_\_\_

own menas by which they comply with the injunction and not have -- there is no good reason, no cause why we should have this particular letter made part of the order vacating the stay.

THE COURT: Do you have a copy of the injunction order, the original injunction order? I don't have it here. Let me look at the injunction order.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me look at it for a moment.

What about that, Mr. Vittum? Why do you want to dictate to the defendants what letter they write to their own dealers? Why?

MR. VITTUM: Well, your Honor, it is not so much that we want to dictate the terms, we are concerned because on March 5th they sent out the "business as usual" letter so promptly. We do think it is important that accurate information be communicated to the Odyssey dealers.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

THE COURT: I will sustain that objection, and look, the order of injunction which has been entered provides that all of the defendants, their agents, are restrained from advertising, distributing, displaying, performing, selling and I take it that the plaintiff is free to write any letter that it may want to anybody it desires. - The Branch Land I think a simple order

No, I don't think we have to go further. See, this changes the injunction order. It makes it mandatory. This is a prohibitory injunction. It restrains the selling, advertising, displaying, performing or offering for sale a videogame cartridge known as K. C. Munchkin and from violating the -- I think you are going further than the injunction order.

MR. VITTUM: That was certainly not the intent, your Honor, but I --

THE COURT: Let's stay within this injunction order. I will sustain the objection and strike the letter from 1t. I am a little Morriso about changing these ships.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

THE COURT: I will prepare the order. It will be prepared, and I am going to reword it and according to the ruling I just made, and I will sustain that objection.

MR. VITTUM: May I just make one further comment in that regard, your Honor.

11 12

14

13

16

15

18

17

19 20

22

21

23

24

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. VITTUM: Would the Court entertain a suggestion of a requirement that the defendant advise the same persons that it advised of the earlier action of the Court that the stay has been vacated?

MR. ANDERSON: Again, your Honor, I think we will comply with the injunction. I think a simple order lifting the stay is all that the Court has to enter or should enter, and we will be governed by our own conscience and the risk that we are wrong.

MR. VITTUM: The problem --

MR. ANDERSON: The plaintiff, as you said, the plaintiff can do what he pleases.

THE COURT: I think, Mr. Vittum, the Court of Appeals had this injunction order before it and the stay.

Now you are changing it. It may be a small matter, but you are adding some mandatory provisions that weren't here.

I am sure the matter will take care of itself. I am a little worried about changing these things.

MR. VITTUM: All right. I appreciate that,

your Honor.

THE COURT: No, just leave it alone.

MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, one other point.

THE COURT: The other thing, you have a \$100,000 bond and if you start changing the terms of the order, you

may change the obligations under the bond.

MR. VITTUM: The point is well taken, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ANDERSON: .Your Honor, as I mentioned this morning, we had planned to file our answer to the new amended complaint today and in view of the time, may I have until tomorrow?

THE COURT: You certainly may.

MR. VITTUM: No objection.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. VITTUM: Thank you, your Honor.

1 A. 1972 BELLEVILLE & Drie 175 Liver Language 175

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Which were all the proceedings had and taken in said cause on said date.)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

ATARI, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs.

VS.

No. 81 C 6434

NORTH AMERICAN PHILIPS CONSUMER ELECTRONICS CORP., et al.,

Defendants.

#### CERTIFICATE

at the hearing of the above-entitled cause before The Honorable GEORGE N. LEIGHTON on March 16, 1982 were reported in shorthand by me and under my direct personal supervision, and that the foregoing transcript, consisting of pages 1 to 148, inclusive, is a true and correct transcript of the original shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

Kay Arbort

Kay Arboit
Official Reporter
United States District Court
Northern District of Illinois
Eastern Division